AUG 6 1963

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1963.

No. 342

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, TO THE USE OF SECRETARY OF BANKING, RECEIVER OF INTEGRITY TRUST COMPANY, TO THE USE OF BUTCHER & SHERRERD, AND FIDELITY-PHILADELPHIA TRUST COMPANY, TRUSTEE,

Appellees,

v.

HARRY J. ALKER, JR. AND MAMIE DuBAN, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS EXECUTRIX OF THE ESTATE OF ALFRED A. DuBAN, DECEASED,

Petitioners-Appellants.

PETITION FOR ALLOWANCE OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT AND APPENDIX.

JAMES J. REGAN, JR.,
1505 Land Title Building,
Philadelphia 10, Pa.,
ROBERT M. TAYLOR,
2215 Land Title Building,
Philadelphia 10, Pa.,
Attorneys for Petitioner Alker.

International, 711 So. 50th St., Phila. 43, Pa.

INDEX.

	Page
Opinions Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented for Review	3
Statement of the Case	4
Reasons for Allowance of the Writ	20
Argument	30
1. The Lower Appellate Court Did Misinterpret, Misconstrue and Mis-apply Federal Civil Rule of Procedure 60(b)	31
2. The Lower Appellate Court Did Misinterpret, Misconstrue and Mis-apply This Honorable Court's Opinion in the Case of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. D'Oench, Duhme Co., 315 U. S. 447	36
3. A District Court Trial Judge, Sitting as a Chancellor in Equity, Has the Right to Grant Petitioner a New Trial, to Reach Justice and Equity, Without Obtaining Permission From the Court of Appeals, to Whom the Matter Has Been Appealed and Affirmed by It	40
4. The Petitioner's Constitutional Rights Were Violated by the Court of Appeals Ordering a Judge, Other Than Judge Welsh (the Trial Chancellor), to Hear Argument on His Motion for a New Trial	41
5. The Lower Court Misinterpreted the Law of Contracts and Its Duty to Ascertain the Definiteness of a Contract When It May Reasonably Be Ascertained From the Facts on Hand and the Circumstances of the Matter	42

INDEX (Continued).

Page

6. Judge Layton, Being a District Judge of Coordinate Jurisdiction Sitting in the Same Court and in the Same Case and Upon the Same Facts, Should Not Overrule the Original Decision of the Prior Judge, Judge Welsh 44

7. As to 12 U. S. C. A. Section 1821(G) It Is Contended That This Act Was Amended by Congress With the Purpose to Prove That Prior to Such Amendment It Was the Intent of Congress That Any Agreement, in the Absence of Fraud, Was Binding on the Corporation 44

Conclusion 45

Appendix:

Deposition of Louis J. Santamarie, Dated December 13, 1946 1a

Direct Examinaiton 1a

Cross-Examination 4a

Re-Direct Examination 5a

Deposition of Louis Santamarie, John A. Barone, Charles D. McAvoy, Dated December 20, 1946 ..... 7a

Louis J. Santamarie—

Direct Examination 7a

Cross-Examination 7a

John A. Barone—

Direct Examination 8a

Cross-Examination 12a

Charles D. McAvoy—

Direct Examination 14a

Cross-Examination 16a

Re-Direct Examination 18a

Re-Cross-Examination 19a

INDEX (Continued).

	Page
Deposition of Charles B. Matsinger, and John Pellini, Dated January 16, 1947	21a
Charles B. Matsinger—	
Direct Examination	21a
Cross-Examination	24a
Re-Direct Examination	27a
Re-Cross-Examination	28a
John Pellini—	
Direct Examination	30a
Cross-Examination	32a
Excerpt From Deposition of John M. Pellini, Dated January 26, 1962	34a
Direct Examination	34a
Cross-Examination	45a
Re-Direct Examination	48a
Opinion (March 27, 1963)	50a
Judgment (March 27, 1963)	50a
Order (November 22, 1961)	51a
Federal Rule 60(b)	53a
12 U. S. C. A. § 1821(g)	54a

CASES CITED.

	Page
Betterman v. American Stores Co., 367 Pa. 193	43
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. Alker, 151 F. 2d 907	38
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. Alker, 234 F. 2d 116	36
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. D'Oench, Duhme Co., 315 U. S. 447	3, 20, 24, 25, 36, 37, 38, 39
Foreman v. Texas & New Orleans R. Co., 205 F. 2d No. 1, page 79	41
Hazel Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford Empire Co., 322 U. S. 238	33
Kirk, Aplnt. v. Brentwood, M. H., Inc. 191 Pa. Superior 492	43
Oil Creek Twp. Sch. Dist. v. Rome Twp. Sch. District, 2 D. & C. 509 (Pa.)	44
Perlman v. 322 West Seventy-second Street Co., 127 F. 2d 716	24
Publicker v. Shallcross, 106 F. 2d 949	32
Rossmassler et al. v. Spielberger et al., 270 Pa. 40	42
Sec'y of Banking of Penna. v. Alker, 183 F. 2d 431	18
T. C. F. Film Corporation v. Gourley, 240 F. 2d 711	44
U. S. v. Wheeler, 256 F. 2d 745	28, 29, 44

TABLE OF STATUTES AND AUTHORITIES CITED.

	Page
Barron and Holtzhoff, Federal Practice and Procedure, Rules Edition under Rule 60(b), pages 436-438	23
8 Cyc. Fed. Prac. § 3584	41
Federal Civil Rule of Procedure 60(b)	3, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 40
Federal Reserve Act, Section 264S	26
Judicial Code, Section 57, U. S. C. Title 28, § 118	34
Ohio State Law Journal, Summer, 1953, Volume 14, No. 3, footnote, page 3	23
Moore & Rogers 688	41
28 U. S. C. 1655	32
12 U. S. C. A. 1821g	37, 44
United States Constitution:	
4th Amendment	20
5th Amendment	20, 41
6th Amendment	20
United States Judiciary Code, Section 1254, 28 U. S. C. A. Section 1254	2
Wright, Vanderbilt Law Review, June 1954, pages 532-533	21
Zollman, Banks and Banking (1936) SS4783	25

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1963.

No.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, TO THE USE OF SECRETARY OF BANKING, RECEIVER OF INTEGRITY TRUST COMPANY, TO THE USE OF BUTCHER & SHERRERD, AND FIDELITY-PHILADELPHIA TRUST COMPANY, TRUSTEE,

Appellees,

v.

HARRY J. ALKER, JR. AND MAMIE DuBAN, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS EXECUTRIX OF THE ESTATE OF ALFRED A. DuBAN, DECEASED,

Petitioners-Appellants.

PETITION FOR ALLOWANCE OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT.

To the Honorable the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

The petitioner, Harry J. Alker, Jr., prays your Honorable Court for allowance of a Writ of Certiorari to review the order and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, entered March 27, 1963, affirming the Order of July 12, 1962, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; and in support thereof, submits the following data and argument:

OPINIONS BELOW.

The Opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, filed March 27, 1963, is not as yet reported. A copy of same is contained in the Appendix herein at page 50a.

Copies of the District Court's Opinion of June 20, 1962, and Memorandum Opinion of July 12, 1962, respectively, are contained on pages 15a-22a and 23a-24a in the Appendix to Petitioners' Appellants' Brief and Appendix.

JURISDICTION.

The judgment of the learned Court of Appeals was entered March 27, 1963. A petition for rehearing was allowed to be filed by the Court and then denied by the Court on May 8, 1963.

The statutory provision conferring jurisdiction on this Honorable Supreme Court of the United States to review said judgment and decision by Certiorari is that invoked under Section 1254 of the United States Judiciary Code, 28 U. S. C. A. Section 1254.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.

1. Did the Lower Appellate Court misinterpret, misconstrue or mis-apply Federal Civil Rule of Procedure 60(b)?

2. Did the Lower Appellate Court, misinterpret, misconstrue or mis apply this Honorable Court's opinion in the case of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. D'Oench Duhme Co., 315 U. S. 447?

3. Does a District Court Trial Judge sitting as a Chancellor in Equity have the right to grant Petitioner a new trial, to reach justice and equity, without obtaining permission from the respective Court of Appeals, to whom the matter has been appealed?

4. Were the Petitioner's constitutional rights violated by the Court of Appeals ordering a Judge other than Judge Welsh (the Trial Chancellor in the case) to hear argument on his Motion for a New Trial?

5. Have the Lower Courts misinterpreted the law of contracts and their duty to ascertain the definiteness of a contract when it may reasonably be ascertained from the facts on hand and the circumstances of the matter?

6. (a) Could Judge Layton, a District Judge of co-ordinate jurisdiction sitting in the same court and in the same case, and upon the same facts, overrule the prior decision of Judge Welsh?

(b) Should Judge Layton have sat at all in the case when Judge Welsh was available?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

This action was initially begun by the filing of a Complaint *in Equity* asking for a deficiency judgment against petitioner, and to compel the National Dairy Products Corporation to transfer to plaintiff certain National Dairy Shares of stock belonging to the Estate of Alfred A. DuBan, Deceased, pledged with said Alker note as collateral security. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation claimed that *it* had acquired the note and the collateral as a holder in due course and when there was no default had attempted to illegally terminate the Alker-DuBan agreement. It subsequently developed, long afterwards, that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation misrepresented the facts to the trial judge and a judgment was entered without all the facts being presented to the Court. This instant proceeding was an application for new trial to present to the Court misrepresentation by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and additional testimony of witnesses, one of whom had not been allowed to testify at the trial by the Court, and other witnesses who had not been available at the time of trial and additional testimony of some witnesses who had been there and had gotten additional information.

In October, 1929, Harry J. Alker, Jr., a then practicing attorney at law in Philadelphia and Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, had a large broker's loan, secured by marketable collateral. The Integrity Trust Company, a corporation organized and existing under laws of the State of Pennsylvania, and whose deposits were insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, took the loan over from the broker. Two demand notes totalling $592,150.00 were given by Alker to the Integrity Trust Company ($350,000.00 and $242,150.00) at its request on or about May 26, 1931, in order that the Integrity Trust Company could use one of these notes together with its pledged collateral in obtaining a loan or advance from the Fidelity

Trust Company of Philadelphia. Later this loan or advance was paid off by Integrity, and the Alker note and collateral were returned by the Fidelity to the Integrity Trust Company.

Prior to September, 1931, the collateral held by the Integrity as security for the loan included 3,400 shares of common stock of National Dairy Products Company owned by Alfred A. DuBan who had loaned them to Alker so that he might employ them as security, as well as other collateral.

By September, 1931, Alker's collateral had become worth less than the required amount and the Integrity desired additional collateral, and so informed Alker. In response thereto, Alker approached his friend, Alfred A. DuBan, for aid. Mr. DuBan was a high official of the National Dairy Products Company, as well as being a large stockholder thereof. He also had private offices in the Land Title Building in Philadelphia, wherein Mr. Alker's law offices were situated.

At approximately the same time in September, 1931, Mr. William F. Fischer, a large manufacturer of machinery in Philadelphia, and also a director of the Integrity Trust Company and a member of its executive committee, was, as such bank official, directed by the Integrity to take up with Mr. Alker the matter of his notes and the obtaining of additional collateral thereon for the protection of the bank.

In pursuance of these purposes, Mr. Fischer and Mr. Alker met in the offices of the Integrity Trust Company, located at 16th and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia. There Mr. Fischer went over his loan matter with Mr. Alker and Mr. Hardt, its President, and Mr. Hardt asked him for additional collateral. Mr. Alker then apprised him that he could probably secure additional collateral consisting of 1000 shares of National Dairy stock belonging to Mr. DuBan upon certain conditions. Mr. Fischer and Mr. Alker then went to Mr. DuBan's office and met with him there.

Mr. DuBan, then and there, stated to Mr. Fischer, in the presence of Mr. Alker, that he would deposit 1000 shares

of National Dairy Stock with the Integrity Trust Company as additional collateral for Mr. Alker's loan, providing Mr. Alker's account would not be disturbed, because, otherwise, there would be no end to putting up additional collateral.

Mr. DuBan, then, on September 29, 1931, signed the assignments of the said 1000 shares of National Dairy stock which were witnessed by Mr. Fischer, for the bank's use, subject to such conditions and agreement, and delivered same to Mr. Fischer.

Mr. Fischer and Mr. Alker then returned to the Integrity's offices and went to Mr. Walter K. Hardt's office, he being the President of the Integrity Trust Company. Before they saw Mr. Hardt, however, they explained the matter to Mr. William G. Semisch, the Vice-President of Integrity in charge of loans and collateral. After hearing them, Mr. Semisch told them they would have to see Mr. Hardt about it. They then went over the entire matter with Mr. Hardt. As a result thereof, Mr. Hardt, for the Integrity, agreed to go along with such arrangement that the Integrity would not disturb the Alker loan provided Mr. DuBan deposited the 1000 shares of National Dairy and Alker put up life insurance in the amount of $100,000.00, assigned certain legal fees and other fees due him from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and paid the interest on the loan, and premiums on the life insurance regularly. This was agreed to by Alker and DuBan; Alker executed the assignment of his fees in favor of the Integrity. The bank placed at that time a life insurance policy for a term of five years. The Integrity believed at that time that it would take five years within which to work out the situation, and fixed the time limit for forbearance at five years and so placed the term policy for five years, extending the loan for five years.

Mr. DuBan and Mr. Alker agreed to all such arrangements and conditions.

The DuBan National Dairy stock was delivered to the Integrity, by Mr. DuBan through Mr. Fischer and accepted

by it. Mr. Alker regularly paid the loan interest and insurance premiums.

The Integrity Trust Company did not again call for additional collateral by Mr. Alker, nor did it attempt to sell his notes or collateral.

It is to be noted that the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, in its opinion on appeal of this case (151 F. 2d 907) assumed that the officers of the Integrity Trust Company agreed that, if Mr. DuBan would put up 1000 more shares of National Dairy stock as additional security for the loan and Alker continued to pay the interest thereon, assigned certain insurance policies to the Trust Company and certain fees due him from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Trust Company would not disturb the loan or the collateral until security values had risen to such a point that Alker could recover his "equity", that there was a valid oral contract to this effect and Alker and DuBan did everything required of them by this contract.

Mr. Hardt testified and deposed that when he met with Mr. Alker and Mr. Fischer, he assured them that, speaking personally and as President of the Integrity Trust Company, the bank's attitude was one of complete cooperation and they would do everything reasonable within their power to make it possible for him to liquidate the loan ultimately at his convenience and, at such a time as might cause him the least embarrassment, and that the DuBan-Alker collateral was delivered to Mr. Semisch by Mr. Fischer, who turned it over to Mr. Antrim.

The said agreement was approved by the executive committee of the Integrity Trust Company of which Mr. William P. Gest was a member. He was also President of the Fidelity Trust Company (which company is one of the use-plaintiffs herein).

In December, 1936, Mr. Alker was called on the telephone by Mr. Hardt, who told him that the bank examiner had been there or was there, and, as Mr. Alker's notes were

five years old, he wanted a new note executed; that as a result thereof, Alker visited Mr. Hardt and spoke to him about the note and again discussed their agreement. Mr. Alker was told by Mr. Hardt that he would put on the new note such phraseology that there would be no question as to the agreement between DuBan, Alker, and the Integrity.

Mr. Alker then executed a new demand note prepared by the Integrity, dated December 11, 1936, in the amount of $592,150.00, which contained among other wording, the following phraseology: "this note is given in substitution and continuance of my demand notes in the original amount of $350,000, dated May 26, 1931, and $242,150, reduced by payments on account to $214,367.51, dated May 26, 1931; other collateral forwarded." The collateral was transferred to it.

The old notes were returned to Alker's messenger, John M. Pellini, by the Integrity to Alker some time in January, 1937, but were not available at the trial of this case.

It was also at this time the five-year term life insurance policy on Mr. Alker's life was expiring, and, as the depression still existed, it was agreed by all the parties concerned that the time of forbearance should and must be extended. The Integrity Trust Company determined it would take ten years more to still work out the situation, so a new ten-year term policy was placed and the loan moratorium and extension agreement were extended for ten more years. The Integrity, by Mr. Semisch, its Vice-President, arranged this insurance through Mr. L. J. Santamarie, an insurance broker and expert, advising Mr. Santamarie it was extending the loan 10 years, and the new policy must be for ten years.

On November 12, 1938, Mr. DuBan died, and letters testamentary were granted to the defendant Mamie DuBan as Executrix.

During all this time, Mr. Alker kept up all his payments of interest and insurance premiums, turned over the

assigned fees as received, and abided by all the terms of the agreement, as did the Integrity Trust Company and its officers.

On or about January 2, 1940, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and The Philadelphia National Bank, Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust Company, First National Bank, Central-Penn National Bank of Philadelphia, Tradesmens National Bank and Trust Company, Market Street Bank, The Pennsylvania Company for Insurances on Lives and Granting Annuities, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company, Girard Trust Company, Drexel & Company, Land Title Bank and Trust Company, Provident Trust Company, and the Integrity Trust Company, all banking institutions under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, executed an agreement that stated whereas Integrity is an "insured bank" as defined in section 12-B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and not being in satisfactory condition to continue in business as an operating bank, was about to apply or had applied to F. D. I. C. for a loan to facilitate the sale of certain of its assets and assumption of its liabilities to its depositors by the First National Bank of Philadelphia and Western Saving Fund Society under the provisions of paragraph 4 of subsection (r) of such section 12-B and that F. D. I. C. had indicated its willingness to make a loan of $21,000,000 for such purpose and on certain conditions.

The said agreement provided that the said associated banks assigned, transferred and set over unto F. D. I. C. their individual, conditioned deposits with the Integrity Trust Company, the Integrity being at that time indebted to the said associated banks deposit liabilities in the aggregate of $9,000,000 subjected to certain restrictions as to payment to the associated banks.

Certain provisions are contained in said agreement providing for F. D. I. C. to liquidate the Integrity's collateral, including that turned over by the associated banks, and

then apply the proceeds according to its plan of agreement, repaying the associated banks.

A copy of said agreement is attached hereto as an exhibit. It is to be noted that the associated banks' assignments were free of any offset, counter-claim, or reduction of any kind or character (Appendix 25a-35a).

On January 13, 1940, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation made a loan of $21,000,000 to the Integrity Trust Company, carrying out the terms of the agreement of January 2, 1940, and, in turn, the Integrity pledged and assigned the Alker note and his collateral, together with all the rest of its banking assets, with certain immaterial exceptions, as security for said loan.

The appellants had no knowledge of this agreement, loan and assignment before the trial of the case and during the trial of the case. It was not for many years later discovered when the F. D. I. C. made a public announcement in the newspapers that the state institutions had been paid back by the F. D. I. C. as liquidating agent all the money that was due them by the Integrity Trust Company (59a).

The Integrity Trust Company immediately thereupon and thereafter January 13, 1940, ceased to do business as a banking institution and the Secretary of Banking became its Receiver in accordance with the laws of Pennsylvania.

On February 22, 1940, the chief supervisor of the F. D. I. C. wrote to Alker requesting a conference, stating that he understood there was an oral agreement concerning the loan. The conference was held and Alker stated to the Supervisor the terms of the oral contract as he understood them. Following this conference, Alker continued to pay the interest on his loan and the insurance premiums and F. D. I. C. did not call the loan.

Thereafter, a representative of F. D. I. C. also had a conference with Alker respecting Alker's loan, Fischer being present. They fully informed him of every circumstance surrounding the loan.

After the said interviews with Alker, and Fischer and Alker and with knowledge of said agreement relating to said loan, F. D. I. C. continued to accept Alker's interest, certain of the assigned fees, and the benefit of the insurance for over two years, never during that time either questioning or intimating an intention of repudiating the agreement. In 1943, F. D. I. C. as liquidator, suddenly arbitrarily repudiated the agreement, and sold to itself all the collateral with the loan at a purported "private sale" although it used the modus operandi of a public sale. Having attempted to do such, and not having done it properly, such sale should be rescinded. Since the sale, the securities have appreciated tremendously, and had they been held as agreed the loan would have been paid in full and the excess collateral would have been returned to the respective parties.

In 1942 F. D. I. C. endeavored to have the DuBan share of National Dairy stock transferred to it. Alker, and Mrs. DuBan as Executrix, protested. Alker advised National Dairy that the proposed transfer was in breach of the oral contract, and National Dairy at first refused to transfer the stocks. Later, the shares were registered in the name of F. D. I. C. as pledgee. Thereafter, F. D. I. C. demanded payment of the loan. On January 20, 1943, payment not having been made, F. D. I. C. sold the collateral, including the National Dairy stock, at private sale to itself for the sum of $358,336.50.

The present equity proceeding was then instituted by the F. D. I. C. after the sale to establish a deficiency against Alker, and to compel the National Dairy Products Corporation to transfer the DuBan stock standing in DuBan's name to Federal Deposit Insurance Company.

The trial of the case, before Judge Welsh, began April 12, 1944, and ending May 3, 1944.

At the trial the F. D. I. C. took the position it was not bound by the agreement with the trust company: that it was a holder in due course of Alker's note, and an alleged lender

without notice; this in spite of the fact that it had accepted the interest and checked the insurance status since 1940, after knowledge of the agreement.

The F. D. I. C. admitted at the trial there had been no default by Alker in the payment of interest or the maintenance of the insurance or the payment of the assigned fees as received.

At no time during the trial did the F. D. I. C. reveal to the Chancellor the fact that it had executed the said agreement of January 2, 1940, with the associated banks, and that it was acting as liquidating agent, not only for itself, but for the twelve associated state banks. Neither did it produce copies of the bank examiner's (Matsinger) reports of his yearly examinations which referred to the Alker-DuBan-Integrity agreement, nor did it call upon Mr. Matsinger, although it knew of him and of his connection with the case. These omissions being performed, despite of and even after the Chancellor, Judge Welsh, announced at the beginning of the second day of the trial, in Court, while Mr. Semisch was on the witness stand, "We can't hurry this case. There are too many factors in this case of great importance, and I want you both to feel you are settled down and *will show me everything*. I want to know everything about this case, gentlemen. I am sitting here as a Court and Jury, and there are things that I want to know fully about the loan" (N. T. 138a and 194a).

At the trial, Judge Welsh refused to hear the testimony of Louis J. Santamarie, the insurance agent, who arranged Alker's life insurance for the Integrity under directions from Mr. Semisch, which said insurance agent was prepared to testify that in the fall of 1936 he saw Mr. Semisch for the purpose of placing a policy of life insurance in connection with a loan of Harry J. Alker, Jr. That Semisch, who was the executive officer of the Integrity in charge of loans, told him he was interested in procuring an insurance policy that would cover the loan, which would run for a minimum period of ten years, because of the fact that Alker

had a loan that would run that time unless it was paid off sooner; that he recommended a form YRT policy for $100,000 for a term of ten years, which he turned over to Mr. Semisch. The Court, without this testimony (which would have clarified the situation), decided the agreement was too indefinite as to time of performance.

The Chancellor found as a fact there was no fraud committed pertaining to the Alker loan by any one.

Judge Welsh, in his opinion dated October 6, 1944, found, inter alia, "* * * it may be conceded that as a result of the conversation described, there was a satisfactory understanding that the loan and collateral would not be "disturbed", as alleged by the defendant, and that the defendant thereby received the desired assurance that he would not soon be faced with a summary demand for payment or additional collateral. Even if the language could be construed to mean that the bank bound itself not to exercise its rights under the terms of the note, the agreement lacks essential definiteness and certainty—certainty as to proof and certainty as to the time of performance, that is, the limit of restraint."

The Chancellor further found that the plaintiff, F. D. I. C., was entitled to recover the unpaid balance of the collateral note amounting to $108,236.89, and ordered and decreed that the National Dairy Products Corporation transfer on its books 4400 shares of the capital stock of said company, registered in the name of Alfred A. DuBan and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as pledgees, to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as owner thereof. On November 8, 1944, judgment was so entered.

On June 9, 1949, after the associated banks had been paid all their proceeds which F. D. I. C. had collected for them, the judgment was marked to the use of the Secretary of Banking of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as Receiver of the Integrity Trust Company. Subsequently the judgment was marked to the use of Butcher & Sherrerd and Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company, Trustee, to whom

the judgment had been assigned in the final accounting of the Secretary of Banking as Receiver for the Integrity Trust Company.

The appellants filed a motion for a new trial on October 23, 1944, which was denied by Judge Welsh on November 30, 1944. The defendants appealed from the District Court's order and judgment to the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Said Appellate Court affirmed the District Court's judgment on November 7, 1945, and that after numerous subsequent motions and other applications by the defendants to the District Court, the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court, the said Court of Appeals, on June 14, 1955, gave the District Court leave to consider another motion by the defendants for a new trial. Such motion was filed on June 16, 1955. An answer was filed by the use-plaintiffs on September 7, 1955. The motion was argued to Judge Welsh in the District Court on October 17, 1955, and was granted by him on November 3, 1955 (App. 1a).

The use-plaintiffs thereupon took an appeal which the defendants moved to dismiss. Subsequently the use-plaintiffs petitioned the Court of Appeals for writs of mandamus and prohibition, directing Judge Welsh to vacate his order granting a new trial and prohibiting him from proceeding with such a trial. Judge Welsh filed an answer, as did Alker, who was permitted to intervene by the Court.

The Court of Appeals, Judges Hastie, Staley, and Maris, sitting, found (234 F. 2d 113), that Judge Welsh did not hold a hearing as directed by said Court in its order of June 14, 1955, nor did he make necessary findings or conclusions, that on the contrary he granted a new trial solely on the allegations of the defendant's motion which were unsupported by evidence and were controverted by the use-plaintiff's Answer; that in this granting a new trial without making the necessary findings and conclusions based on evidence produced at a hearing, Judge Welsh exceeded his authority under Rule 60(b). Moreover, he failed to follow the express direction of this Court that he should

also decide the jurisdictional question, that is, whether the motion was one which Rule 60(b) empowered him to grant.

Accordingly, the Court of Appeals issued a writ of mandamus directing Judge Welsh to vacate the order which he entered in the District Court on November 3, 1955, granting the defendant's motion for a new trial and thereupon to reconsider and dispose of that motion in a manner not inconsistent with its opinion, and, in view of the issuance of the writ of mandamus the appeal of the use-plaintiffs from the order in question was dismissed.

On November 22, 1961, upon consideration of the motion of Harry J. Alker, Jr., dated November 15, 1961, to reopen the case and place his motion for a new trial in this action (243 F. 2d 113) on the argument list; together with a petition to take depositions of witnesses in support thereof whose testimony was not already in the record, it was ordered, adjudged and decreed by President Judge Thomas J. Clary that said motion to reopen the case and place upon the argument list his motion for a new trial be and it is hereby granted; depositions of any witnesses whose testimony is not already in the record to be taken and completed on or before January 15, 1962, and the motion thereafter to be promptly listed for argument upon special application to the Honorable Caleb B. Layton, III, United States District Judge of Delaware, specially assigned to hear and dispose of said motion.

The following order was filed with the Clerk of the Court by the Honorable Judge Caleb R. Layton, III, specially assigned, on January 18, 1962, to wit:

> "And Now, to wit, this 17th day of January, 1962, upon motion of Robert M. Taylor, Esquire, attorney for Harry J. Alker, Jr., one of the defendants named in the above entitled matter, and after hearing, and over objection of counsel for plaintiffs, the order of Chief Judge Clary, dated November 22, 1961, ordering that depositions of any witnesses whose testimony is not already in the record to be taken and completed on or

before January 15, 1962, is hereby amended to extend the time of preparing and filing of such depositions, to February 1, 1962. It is further ordered that said defendant's brief for the argument of this matter shall be filed not later than February 20, 1962; and the plaintiff's brief shall be filed not later than March 20, 1962; and that date of argument shall be March 26, 1962."

The deposition of John Pellini, who had not testified in court, was taken and filed with the Clerk of the District Court on February 1, 1962.

The depositions of Louis J. Santamarie were taken on December 13 and 20, 1946; and the depositions of John A. Barone and Charles D. MacAvoy were taken on December 20. The depositions of Charles B. Matsinger and John Pellini were taken on January 16, 1947. All of the said depositions named in this paragraph were first filed with the Court of Appeals and recently were filed with the District Court under Civil Action No. 3047.

The trial court found, as stated, against the defendants because of alleged indefiniteness of time in the contract. This, however, was later corrected by witnesses who were finally located, and whose existence was not known before. At the time of trial Alker was in the hospital and had himself brought to the trial by nurses. He was very ill before the trial and during the trial which seriously affected the preparation of his defense and the trial of his case. His office manager, John Pellini, who handled his loan and note matters was serving in the United States Army in Europe. The witness, Louis J. Santamarie, the insurance agent who placed Alker's ten-year term insurance policy upon the information, orders and instructions of the Integrity's Vice-President Semisch, was at the trial, but was not allowed to testify by Judge Welsh. His testimony would certainly have cleared up the time element in the case and defendant contends this action by the trial court was a reversible error. John Pellini's testimony would have also explained

the time element as well as indicating who handled Mr. Alker's old notes and new note and the dates the various phrasing was put upon them.

Argument was then heard on appellants-defendants' Motion For a New Trial under Federal Rule 60(b) and other reasons, before the Honorable Caleb Layton, III, District Court Judge. On June 19, 1962, the said trial Judge filed his opinion denying the said motion. A copy of said opinion is contained in the appendix (15a).

Immediately thereafter the appellants-defendants filed a Motion for Reargument. Said Motion was denied by the Trial Judge in a memorandum opinion filed July 11, 1962 (23a).

Wherefore appellants filed a timely appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit asking for a hearing thereon.

On March 7, 1963, the said Court of Appeals heard petitioner's appeal and on March 27, 1963, filed its opinion affirming the District Court's findings. Said opinion of the court stated: "Per curiam on review of the record we find no error. The District Court's denial of appellants' motion for a new trial will be affirmed for the reasons so well stated by Judge Layton in his opinion filed June 20, 1962, and his memorandum opinion filed July 12, 1962." Petitioner filed a petition for Re-hearing which was denied by the Court of Appeals on May 8, 1963, hence this petition for allowance of a writ of certiorari.

On July 28, 1948, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation presented a motion for leave to substitute the Secretary of Banking, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Receiver of Integrity Trust Company, as party plaintiff on the ground that F. D. I. C. had received full payment of its loan to Integrity Trust Company. Alker opposed this motion, and subsequently filed a renewal of the motion for new trial. On March 3, 1949, the trial judge granted the motion for new trial and denied the motion to substitute the Secretary of Banking for F. D. I. C. as party plaintiff. The F. D. I. C.

thereupon applied to the Appellate Court for writs of mandamus and prohibition against the order of March 3, 1949. On May 9, 1949, an order granting new trial was vacated and an order substituting the Secretary of Banking as party plaintiff was granted. Alker appealed from both of these orders, the Appellate Court on September 7, 1950, sustaining the order vacating the motion for new trial but reversing the order substituting the Secretary of Banking as party plaintiff. On September 7, 1950, the judgment against Alker was marked to the use of Secretary of Banking, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Receiver of Integrity Trust Company.

ORDER.

(Filed March 3, 1949.)

AND NOW, to wit, this 3rd day of March, A. D. 1949, having heard the argument, considered the briefs submitted by the parties and examined the entire record in the case to date, it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that defendant's motion for a new trial be and the same is hereby granted.

It is further ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that plaintiff's motion to substitute the Secretary of Banking, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Receiver of Integrity Trust Company, as party plaintiff for Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation be and the same is hereby denied.

GEO. A. WELSH,
Judge.

(See *Sec'y of Banking of Penna. v. Alker*, 183 F. 2d 431 (10015).)

As it is seen therefore, the F. D. I. C. is still the responsible party herein and petitioner submits it must still account to him for his collateral. As to Butcher-Sherrerd it picked up, for so many cents on the dollar, various claims against the Integrity.

Reference is made to Chief Judge Clary's order of November 22, 1961, wherein he ordered, ". . . depositions of any witnesses whose testimony is not already in the record to be taken and completed on or before January 15, 1962, . . ."

It was the petitioner's and his counsel's understanding and interpretation of this order that none of the witnesses who had testified at the trial or who had previously given depositions in the matter could not testify and give any further testimony at the new hearing.

It is petitioner's contention that he should have been permitted to have depositions taken of these and previous witnesses as to any new facts he had not testified to before.

It is to be noted that after the F. D. I. C. made its loan to the Integrity Trust Company and took over Alker's obligation and collateral on his loan, Alker for over a period of two years regularly made his payments of interest to the F. D. I. C., and paid the premiums regularly on his life insurance policies; and the F. D. I. C. recognized this agreement made by Alker and DuBan, receiving from Alker the interest regularly and having produced to it evidence of payment of the insurance premiums. These payments of interest were even paid by Alker and accepted by F. D. I. C. Alker also tendered payments of interest after this time for years, but it was refused by F. D. I. C.

REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE OF THE WRIT.

There are several questions of great importance raised in this case that will have immediate importance far beyond the particular facts and parties involved herein, and it is therefore vital that these questions involved should be decided finally by this Honorable Supreme Court. Some of these questions include whether this matter should be controlled by the general rules of equity and justice, the action having been an equity action, (1) the misapplication or misconstruing or misinterpretation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) by the Court below; (2) the misapplication or misconstruing or misinterpretation of this Honorable Court's Opinion in the case of *Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. D'Oench Duhme Co.*, 315 U. S. 447; (3) a conflict between a District Court with its Appellate Court; constitutional questions pertaining to due process and equal protection of the laws, a fair and impartial trial and hearing, and unreasonable seizure of property, as provided respectively in the 5th, 6th, and 4th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States; and the exercise by this Court of its supervisory power over lower Federal Courts.

(1) This action was initially begun by the filing of a Complaint *in Equity* asking for a deficiency judgment against petitioner, and to compel the National Dairy Products Corporation to transfer to plaintiff certain National Dairy shares of stock belonging to the Estate of Alfred A. DuBan, Deceased, pledged with said Alker note as collateral security. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation claimed that *it* had acquired the note and the collateral as a holder in due course and when there was no default had attempted to illegally terminate the Alker-DuBan agreement. It subsequently developed, long afterwards, that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation misrepresented the facts to the trial judge and a judgment was entered

without all the facts being presented to the Court. This instant proceeding was an application for new trial to present to the Court misrepresentation by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and additional testimony of witnesses, one of whom had not been allowed to testify at the trial by the Court, and other witnesses who had not been available at the time of trial and additional testimony of some witnesses who had been there and had gotten additional information, such evidence would have proven the definiteness of the Alker-DuBan-Integrity agreement, and also, that it was not a "secret" agreement.

(2) The question pertaining to Rule 60(b) is that of "whether or not the permission of the Appellate Court is required to give relief from a judgment in appropriate cases, even though the judgment was affirmed on appeal." This question has raised great discussion nationally, and has been the subject of many Law School Review articles as well as being in process as an Advisory Rules Committee recommended new Amendment to the Rule.

Hon. Charles Alan Wright, Associate Professor of Law, University of Minnesota: Assistant to the Reporter, United States Supreme Court's Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure, writes, in the "Vanderbilt Law Review" of June 1954, pages 532-533:

> "The Advisory Committee has proposed two Amendments to Rule 60(b). The Amendment which is here taken up is a classic example of how and why Courts add to rules glosses which rule making Committees must remove. Before the adoption of the Federal Rules, it was necessary to get leave from the Appellate Court before seeking to reopen a judgment which had been affirmed on appeal. The rule on this subject made no such requirement. Since, in other rules, a requirement of appellate permission was clearly stated, it is fair to suppose that the Committee deliberately refrained from making any such requirement in the care-

ful provisions of Rule 60(b). There were a few Court decisions on this point. Some of the decisions pointed out that the rule required no appellate permission, and therefore said that there need be no such permission. Other decisions applied, without much consideration, the pre-Rules requirement of appellate leave. All the decisions, one way and the other, were obscure and little noticed.

Then, within this last year, the Third Circuit was confronted with a hard case. It involved a hyperlitigious appellant who had been previously before the Court of Appeals four times and had fourteen times sought review in the Supreme Court by means of petitions for certiorari, motions for rehearings of denials of certiorari, and applications for leave to file yet more Motions for Rehearing. One can easily sympathize with the desire of the Appellate judges to see the case terminated, and understand their dismay when one of their district judges granted a motion to reopen the judgment and have a new trial. But one can also see here the truth of the old maxim that hard cases make bad law.

For here the Appellate Court handed down a striking opinion, loaded with quotable epigrams, in which it announced it is beyond the jurisdiction of a district judge to grant such a motion reopening a judgment which had been affirmed on appeal unless the Appellate Court has first given leave. It grants writs of prohibition and mandamus requiring the district judge to vacate his order allowing a new trial.

It is bad enough that the Third Circuit, regardless of the provocation, added a requirement to the rule which the rule does not contain. Worse yet, the requirement so added is a particularly unfortunate one, which would introduce into an attempted simplification of the practice for reopening judgments a useless and delaying formalism. An Appellate Court has no idea

whether the requirements for reopening a case under Rule 60(b) are met until there has been a full record developed. Such a record can only be made in the Trial Court. Of course the District Judge is not free to flaunt the decision of the Appellate Court so far as it goes, but he should be free to consider whether some circumstances of fraud or mistaken or excusable neglect or newly discovered evidence not previously known to either Court compels a new trial. If the Trial Judge goes too far, and grants, in effect, a rehearing of the Appellate Court's decision, the normal processes of review are still open. To require in every case the formality of application to the Appellate Court, which has no facility for examining the merits of the claim for a new trial, to guard against the possibility that a rare District Judge may go too far, is inconsistent with the entire philosophy of the rules. Thus the Committee has proposed the addition to Rule 60(b) a sentence negativing the requirement of Appellate leave."

The above is also discussed in Barron and Holtzhoff's Federal Practice and Procedure, Rules Edition under Rule 60(b), pages 436-438.

The Court of Appeals has restrained District Court Judge Welsh from giving and holding a new trial for petitioner, even though he has twice decided that under Rule 60(b) and particularly by #5 and #6 therein petitioner is entitled to such new trial.

The "Ohio State Law Journal" of the "Summer of 1953" Volume 14, No. 3, states in a footnote, page 3, "A recent striking example of judicial propensity to rewrite procedural rules in Butcher & Sherrerd v. Welsh, 3rd Cir. Aug. 5, 1963, imparting into the broad term of Rule 60(b) a requirement for its use of upper court permission in any case where an appeal has been filed. See, in re Long Island Lighting Company, 197 F. 2d 709, 710 (2d Cir. 1952), S. C. Johnson and Son v. Johnson, 175 F. 2d 176, 177, 184 (2d

Cir.), 949, cert. denied 338 U. S. 860 (1949), Perlman v. 322 West Seventy-second Street Co., 127 F. 2d 716, 719 (2d Cir. 1942)."

As has been seen in the instant case, the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit requires its permission to a District Court Trial Judge before he can reopen a judgment and grant a new trial where it has been affirmed on appeal. It appears that the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit does not require that its permission be obtained in similar circumstances and cases (*Perlman v. 322 West Seventy-second Street Co.*, 127 F. 2d 716, 719).

It can readily be seen, therefore, that this is a question of Federal law, and a conflict between circuits, which has not been, but should be, decided by this Honorable Supreme Court.

(2) The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has decided an important Federal question of substance in conflict with the applicable decisions of this Honorable Supreme Court of the United States, the said Court of Appeals basing its decision in the instant case on the case of *Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. D'Oench, Duhme Co.*, 315 U. S. 447, which your petitioner submits was never intended by your Honorable Court to apply to a case like the present one.

In the *D'Oench, Duhme* case there was fraud and an attempt to avoid liability. In petitioner's case there was no fraud, nor was there an attempt to avoid liability. There is no claim that under the agreement in this case Alker was not to be liable on the note at all. It was merely an agreement defining the time of payment of his demand note unless a default was committed in the meantime; and the arrangement for collateral security of said note. No default by Alker ever took place.

The cases following *D'Oench, Duhme* relate to accommodation makers and are cases where there was a definite

effort to make assets of a bank appear of greater value and validity than they actually were, and thus deceive the bank examiners as to the authenticity of the note and the true condition of the bank.

The basis of the *D'Oench, Duhme* case is a Federal policy to protect the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the public funds which it administers against misrepresentation as to securities or other assets in the portfolios of banks which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insured, or to which it makes loans, 315 U. S. 447, 457. It is the "evil tendency" of the acts to contravene the policy governing banking transactions which lies at the root of the "Rule" in *D'Oench, Duhme*. The Court in so ruling relied on Zollman, Banks and Banking (1936) 8847&3. That section deals with cases where the officers of a bank tried by a secret agreement to conceal or misrepresent the true condition of assets of the bank in order to obtain insurance of deposits from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Those are not the facts of this instant case. The identical assets with one exception were with the Integrity Trust Company, the insured state bank, at the time the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insured the said state bank, as were there when these assets were taken over by it in 1940. The only change was that petitioner executed a new note in 1936 to replace the original two notes. The new note on its face clearly recited that it was "in extension of and substitution for the previous notes," which notation the bank officials testified was notice to everyone of a special agreement attached to the note. There is no evidence in the record that the petitioners or the State bank (Integrity) officials made any misrepresentation of the securities and other collateral pledged for this loan, their genuiness or integrity. Even the bank examiners as testified to by Mr. Matsinger, the chief bank examiner for Pennsylvania, were well aware of the collateral and of an agreement between Alker and the Integrity. This is certainly indicated in the Pennsylvania bank examiners' reports.

If this decision is allowed to stand it will be a great miscarriage of justice; it will impose upon every borrower from, or customer of a bank, the impossible duty of seeing that the records of the bank show his transaction with the banks. A borrower or customer should not be penalized because of the failure of the institution's records, without his knowledge, to satisfactorily show his transactions with it, where the transaction is clear and above reproach.

Also, in view of the fact that the Court of Appeals based its decision on Section 264S of the Federal Reserve Act, which is a criminal provision (and which Congress later removed from this Act), and there was nothing concealed or criminal about this "Alker" transaction, is it fair, just, equitable and conscionable that this decision should stand in a United States Court of Equity?

(4) Here in the instant case, we have the District Court Judge Welsh, who sat as the Chancellor and heard the case tried, insisting that he has the inherent right as the Trial Judge, to grant Petitioner a new trial to serve justice and equity; and the Court of Appeals that says, no, you cannot grant the Petitioner a new trial, without first obtaining permission from us, as the matter is with us on appeal.

Petitioner contends that, in the instant case, where the Trial Chancellor found, from the facts submitted to him, that justice and equity required granting Petitioner a new trial, then he had the legal and inherent right to do so; and, further, under Rule 60(b) if it did apply he was not restricted from doing so as the Rule nowhere refers to obtaining permission of an Appellate Court to do so. And further, Judge Welsh, sitting as a Chancellor in Equity, always retained control over his Court's judgment to make it conform with a change in circumstances between the parties.

(5) As to due process and equal protection of the law, and fair trial, we have here a mandate from the Court of Appeals directly to *Chancellor Welsh* to hear and make find-

ings; but when the time arrived to do so, a different judge was appointed by the Court of Appeals to sit at said hearing. This being done, although Chancellor Welsh was present and available. Petitioner's motion to reopen the case was filed on *November 15, 1961.* The Honorable Judge Layton was assigned to the case on December 8, 1961. On December 4, 1961, Judge Welsh was restricted by order of Chief Judge Biggs of the Court of Appeals to hear the following type of cases: (1) General Naturalizations, (2) Uncontested Motions, and (3) Matters Appearing on Argument List. On December 28, 1961, a further order of Chief Judge Biggs of the Court of Appeals, amended the order of December 4, 1961, by limiting Judge Welsh to hearing only "Naturalizations" and "Uncontested Motions".

It is Petitioner's contention that Judge Welsh was the Trial Judge and Chancellor who heard the case and granted him the new trial, and to whom the Court of Appeals *pointed* the mandate to have a hearing on Petitioner's Motion for a New Trial. He, therefore, would be the correct one to decide whether or not fraud had been practiced upon his Court, and whether or not such new evidence produced by petioner would result in granting a new trial.

(6) Also, that it follows, if the Petitioner's constitutional rights were violated by the alleged improper actions mentioned above, the seizure of his assets and property by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would be unreasonable and unlawful.

(7) As to the Lower Courts' determinations of contract law, it is contended by Petitioner that it erred in not finding Petitioner had a good, lawful, binding contract with the Integrity Trust Company. Their error arises from assuming that as it found there was no period of duration of the agreement stated, that it must be held void for uncertainty.

Petitioner further claims the Court should have deduced the terms from the nature of the subject-matter and

the facts affecting it. The Courts should have construed the agreement as to carry into effect the reasonable intention of the parties as it was or could have been ascertained with reasonable certainty.

The additional testimony of the new, available witnesses, including Pellini, Matsinger and Santamarie, certainly proved definiteness of the time of the agreement which would corroborate and verify the deduced findings of the Court, and the Alker-DuBan agreement was not a "secret-concealed" agreement.

It is to be noted by all the evidence in the case that Alker carried out completely all of the terms and conditions of the Alker-DuBan-Integrity agreement and therefore the sale of the collateral accompanying his note by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was improper and unlawful and petitioner Alker therefore contends that he should be placed in his proper position as owner of said collateral; and which collateral should be ordered returned to him by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, subject to payment of any amount due on his loan, with credit given to Alker for interest and dividends that would have been received on said collateral.

(8) A further cogent reason for this Court's review of the decision below is based upon the sound proposition that one district judge of coordinate jurisdiction with another district judge may not review a prior ruling of a first district judge in such a way as to overrule his granting of a new trial, particularly where the first district judge who granted the new trial was also the trial judge who heard the case originally and who handled all intervening motions and rules regarding the case.

This is especially illustrated by the decision of the Honorable Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit below in the case of *U. S. v. Wheeler*, 256 F. 2d 745, wherein the Court below emphasized as follows: "As we have pointed out, the heart of the matter is whether a second judge could

properly entertain a reconsideration at all. We have indicated that if the first judge is available, the matter should again be presented to him."

In this particular case the Honorable George A. Welsh was and still is living and available as a reviewing judge for the reconsideration of a new trial motion. It follows, therefore, that the learned Court of Appeals below erroneously failed to follow its own ruling in the *Wheeler* case when it went outside the Eastern District of Pennsylvania entirely to find a "*stranger*" jurist in the District of Delaware.

This is so important a ruling and one which would seem to require uniformity throughout the nation, especially since it appears that there is a conflict of views between the Courts of Appeal of the Third Circuit and of the Second Circuit on this precise point of law.

ARGUMENT.

A careful perusal of all of the facts concerning this matter clearly indicates that the old adage of "losing sight of the forest for the trees" was applicable hereto. Throughout the long years of litigation and in each and every Court in which this matter has been vigorously pressed, it becomes apparent that the basic concept of equitable justice has been ignored in that emphasis has always been placed upon strict adherence to civil rules such as 60(b). During the course of the long years of protracted litigation, most certainly a new trial could have been given to the petitioner herein without having caused anyone any undue hardship to any of the parties concerned. It would appear from the opinions of the various Courts, other than the opinions of Judge Welsh granting a new trial, that they would rather rely upon the theory that their hands are tied by the rule which would preclude them from actually granting an opportunity to the petitioner to acquire justice for himself, particularly concerning a matter which basically is his entire life. We urge upon this Court that in any set of facts if for one moment there does exist a rule which by its operation would amount to creating an injustice concerning a matter which is most vital to a litigant, such a rule would be unconstitutional and, to say the least, would be adverse to all principles of equity. We urge upon this Court that the long history of the sincere and undying efforts of the petitioner in this case is more than conclusive proof of the fact that he in his own heart knows full well that if the Court would allow him a new trial he could prevail to the extent that he would receive the justice and equity which he has so long sought and fought for. In many respects the position of the petitioner herein and at his ripe, old, age, feels the importance of this request for justice and equity has been no different than if this were a criminal matter. We appeal to this Honorable Court's broad powers to afford relief despite

the existence of any rules, which apparently seem to be to the contrary. We urge this without for one moment relinquishing the fact that we believe even from a strict legal interpretation, the petitioner is and was entitled to his proper day in Court.

In addition to the above, we are herewith presenting further argument, as follows:

1. The Lower Appellate Court Did Misinterpret, Misconstrue and Mis-apply Federal Civil Rule of Procedure 60(b).

A perusal and review of petitioner's Motion for a New Trial (Brief Appendix 1-A) will show that the request for relief under rule 60(b) was only one of the many requests for relief under petitioner's said motion. There are many other reasons stated therein for a new trial which call for the exercise of equity and justice independent of said rule 60(b); and on which the Court could have based an independent action for a new trial as requested by petitioner, to use his motion also as an independent action for a new trial. A perusal also of the record discloses that petitioner began making motions for a new trial as early as October 23, 1944, and continued making them until the present motion was acted upon. A reading of Federal Civil Procedure rule 60(b) indicates that nowhere therein does it provide that a lower trial Court must obtain the permission of an Appellate Court to grant a motion for a new trial when equity and justice calls for same, even though the case has been referred to the Appellate Court for action. This has become a national question of argument among the rule makers and Courts as to whether said permission is required as this matter has been shown in petitioner's reasons for allowance of the writ, and will not be repeated here.

A reading of said rule also reflects that said rule does not limit the power of the Court to entertain an independent action to relieve a party from a judgment or—to grant relief to a defendant not actually personally notified as

provided in title 28 U. S. C. 1655, or to set aside the judgment for fraud upon the Court.

In Petitioner's said motion for new trial, he alleges, in Paragraph 4 therein, fraud and misrepresentation by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation upon the Court. The petitioner contends and submits that he presented sufficient evidence to the lower Court as to fraud and misrepresentation upon the Court by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which should take it out of the one-year rule and cites the case of *Publicker v. Shallcross*, 106 F. 2d 949, Third Circuit Court of Appeals opinion in which that Court apparently found that a Court could open a judgment any time where fraud and misrepresentation upon the Court have been exercised and not just within any restricted period (see page 36b Appellants' Brief).

It is further contended by the petitioner that the District Trial Judge and Chancellor did not have to obtain permission of the Appellate Court in order for him to grant petitioner's motion for a new trial to see that equity and justice is reached.

It appears that District Judge Layton based his decisions upon rule 60(b) as the sole reason for reaching the conclusions that he did, and that he did not consider all the other reasons mentioned for granting a new trial.

As we have seen, Judge Welsh (48 FRD 497) found that petitioner was entitled to a new trial on the ground of newly discovered evidence, and that, in his judgment, justice and equity required that the defendant Alker should have an opportunity to submit the type of evidence referred to by Alker so that any facts elucidated may be embodied in the findings of fact and conclusions of law and in any opinion subsequently filed in the case.

As has been seen in its opinion, the Court of Appeals issued a writ of mandamus directing Judge Welsh to vacate his order granting petitioner's motion for a new trial and thereupon to reconsider and dispose of that motion in a manner not inconsistent with that Court's opinion.

These directions thereby brought the instant case within the latter part of Clause (5) of Rule 60(b) providing that a Court may relieve a party from a prior judgment that is no longer equitable and should not have prospective application, and Clause (6), even though more than one year or more has elapsed since the date of trial.

Notwithstanding these clear exceptions to the one-year limitation on new trial motions, Judge Layton, in discussing Rule 60(b), in his opinion studiously avoids any other mention of the latter part of Clause (5), glosses over it, and hastens to show why a new trial is not justified under Clause (6). Nowhere in his opinions does Judge Layton refer to a judgment that is no longer equitable to have prospective application. All this avoidance to the latter part of Clause (5) being made even though the Trial Chancellor found that justice and equity required that Alker should have an opportunity to submit his evidence at a new trial based upon this Clause (5), certainly requires some consideration by this Honorable Supreme Court.

Neither do Judge Layton's opinions refer to or cover petitioner's allegations of fraud and misrepresentation practiced upon the Court by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. This Supreme Court has held that a Court may at any time set aside a judgment for after-discovered fraud upon the Court. *Hazel Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford Empire Co.*, 322 U. S. 238.

The petitioner contends and submits that he has produced evidence to prove that the District Court can and should relieve him from said judgment, particularly, under Clauses (2) and (3) as his motions for a new trial were continuing and inclusive motions and should not be restricted by the one-year period, and further as to fraud and misrepresentation without restriction, and under Clauses (5) and (6) in that the judgment is no longer equitable and should no longer have prospective application and that there is extraordinary cause for justifying relief from the operation of the judgment.

It appears that the procedure in this matter concerning Rule 60(b) is in two phases, and they are the provisions of Rule 60(b) *before* and *after* its amendment in 1948. In the early Rule 60(b) it provided, inter alia, "This rule does not limit the power of a Court (1) to entertain an action to relieve a party from a judgment, order, or proceeding, or (2) to set aside *within one year*, as provided in Section 57 of the Judicial Code, U. S. C. Title 28, § 118, a judgment obtained against a defendant not actually personally notified". It also states, inter alia, ". . . on motion of the Court, upon such terms as are just, may relieve a party or his legal representative from a judgment, order, or proceeding taken against him through his mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect. The motion shall be made within a reasonable time, but in no case exceeding six months after such judgment, order, or proceeding was taken. A motion under this sub-division does not affect the finality of a judgment or suspend its operation. . . ."

Old Rule 60(b) was amended to include, among other provisions, Clauses (5) and (6) particularly the latter part of (5) affording relief from further prospective operation of an inequitable judgment; and the 6th reason for relief from a judgment for "any other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment." For these two clauses or provisions for relief no time limit is prescribed, but of course the motion must be made in a reasonable time. The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has found that petitioner's motion for a new trial was timely filed.

It also appears that Judge Welsh, when he granted petitioner's motion for a new trial, was referring to old Rule 60(b) as he states in his opinion of November 3, 1955 (18 F. R. D. 497). ". . . The Trial Judge was confronted with the one-year limitation in the Supreme Court Rules, Fed. Rules Civ. Proc. rule 60(b), 28 U. S. C. pertaining to the subject and realized that, technically, the defendant Alker's request for a new trial was barred. But having in

mind that the fundamental purpose of the Court is to secure justice, under law, and that the rules of Court which are of their own making are subject to their own interpretation in the light of precedent, tradition and equitable principles, we granted the motion for a new trial. The Trial Judge was moved very strongly to this conclusion by the allegations of defendant Alker that the witnesses he could produce upon a new trial and which he could not present at the first trial would testify on the very subject matter which was the controlling policy in the Supreme Court decision which ruled that case. . . . " " . . . The Circuit Court in its wisdom took the view that the one-year limitation of the Supreme Court Rules barred the granting of a new trial. . . . " "Pursuant to that authority we proceeded to have a hearing on the motion of defendant Alker for a new trial. Briefs were filed by both sides, decisions cited, and the case fully argued from all angles considered pertinent. The case is now before us as if no appeal had been taken, the writs of prohibition and mandamus having been vacated. We therefore are approaching the question as though the defendant Alker, in due course and timely, had moved for a new trial, not upon errors of law or anything that took place at the trial, but based solely upon affidavits of the substance of the evidence he would produce. In our judgment justice and equity require that defendant Alker have an opportunity to submit this type of evidence so that any facts elucidated may be embodied in the findings of fact and conclusions of law in any opinion subsequently filed in the case. The discretion and latitude allowed a Trial Judge in granting a new trial must not be exercised with capriciousness or arbitrarily but with a conscientious feeling as Chancellor that these additional witnesses should be heard, not at this time, but at a new trial where the testimony produced by direct examination and cross-examination could be the basis of findings of fact. Feeling as we do, we grant the motion for a new trial, leaving to the Appellate tribunals the question

of the interpretation and application of the one-year limitation in Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of civil procedure."

Later, however, after the amendments of Rule 60(b) had been in effect and force, it appears Judge Welsh considered petitioner's motion for a new trial, under the light of the new Rule 60(b) with all its amendments, including its clauses (5) and (6).

In *Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. Alker*, 234 F. 2d, page 116, Judge Maris states, ". . . It is not for a district judge thus to abdicate his functions to interpret and apply the law, the very task he was commissioned to perform. On the contrary it is his basic duty to determine whether he has power before he assumes to exercise it. He is bound, just as we are, to interpret and apply the Federal Rules of civil procedure which have the force of statutes and are binding upon him. In belated recognition of this duty, Judge Welsh, in his Answer to the Petition for writs of mandamus and prohibition states that he granted the motion for a new trial because he believes that Rule 60(b) was not a bar to his so doing. He also suggests in his Answer that clauses (5) and (6) of Rule 60(b), which give the District Court power to relieve a party from a judgment for the reason that "it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application", clause (5) or for "any other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment, clause (6) furnishes a basis for his action".

2. The Lower Appellate Court Did Misinterpret, Misconstrue and Mis-apply This Honorable Court's Opinion in the Case of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. D'Oench, Duhme Co., 315 U. S. 447.

Your petitioner submits that this Honorable Supreme Court never intended, in its opinion in the *D'Oench, Duhme* case, to apply to anything but a fraud case; nor that the criminal section of the Federal Reserve Act should so apply. (See Justice Roberts' letter (63a of Appellants' Brief and Appendix).)

It is contended that the *D'Oench, Duhme* case refers only to outright fraud and criminal matters, none of which were alleged, pleaded or found herein. Even Congress deleted the criminal statute from the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as well as passing the Act of September 21, 1950, providing that the rights of depositors and other creditors of a State Bank shall be determined in accordance with the applicable provisions of State law (12 U. S. C. A. 1821g).

In attempting to justify his application of the decision in *D'Oench, Duhme Co. v. F. D. I. C.*, Judge Layton concludes that the extension agreement was still a secret one as far as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was concerned. (Appellants' Brief and Appendix 21a). This, it is contended, is contrary to the evidence.

Judge Layton has not apparently given any weight or credence to Mr. Matsinger's (the Pennsylvania bank examiner) testimony, affidavits, depositions and reports. This evidence in itself is sufficient to take this matter out of the *D'Oench, Duhme* doctrine of a "secret agreement". Matsinger's evidence definitely indicates that he and other bank examiners knew of Alker's agreement, loan and collateral. Even, George W. Brown, President of the Integrity Trust Company, testified that he had talked to the bank examiners about the Alker loan (P. 287(a) of N. T., cases Nos. 10002 and 10015).

Howard B. Dietz, one of plaintiff's witnesses, and a Federal Reserve bank examiner, testified that "Mr. Malsinger" (Matsinger), the State Department examiner, met with and talked to the officers of the Integrity and went over their report with them (P. 319(a) N. T. Cases Nos. 10002 and 10015).

Inasmuch as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation had knowledge of Mr. Matsinger and his official State reports at the trial, there is a presumption that he would have testified adversely to plaintiff's contentions had he been called.

Again petitioner submits that there has been a misinterpretation, misconstrual and misapplication of the *D'Oench, Duhme* case to this case by the Court of Appeals; that the facts of this case are entirely different from *D'Oench, Duhme* and the case does not apply.

Referring to the Court of Appeals' opinion in *Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. Alker*, 151 F. 2d 907, Chief Judge Biggs apparently finds that there was a valid oral contract between Alker and DuBan and Integrity. He assumed that there was a valid oral contract, and that Alker and DuBan did everything required of them by this contract. However, he found that even this being so, petitioner could not get over the hurdle of such a contract being a secret agreement not mentioned in the Integrity's records, and, therefore, not known to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation when it took over the Integrity's assets. That such a contract being a secret one, it was controlled by the doctrine of the *D'Oench, Duhme* case, and therefore could not be enforced.

Chief Judge Biggs, at the end of his opinion, states "taking this view, the issue upon which the case turns is one of law, and for this reason it is not necessary to remand the case for necessary and proper findings by the Court below."

The petitioner, in consideration of the above paragraph, submits to this Honorable Supreme Court that if Chief Judge Biggs had remanded the case for necessary and proper findings by the District Court, he would have ordered the Trial Court to find that the Alker-DuBan-Integrity contract was a valid, oral contract.

It further appears throughout all of the Opinions of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit that the actual and sole basis of its finding against petitioner, Alker, is the doctrine of the *D'Oench, Duhme* case as controlling his case. That Court finds that the facts in *D'Oench, Duhme* closely resemble the facts of the Alker case at bar, and states that

any differences that exist are immaterial. How it can make such a finding is hard to perceive. Comparing them we see that that deception and fraud was intentionally and actually practiced, whereas in the Alker case there was no fraud or deception committed. The note in *D'Oench, Duhme* was executed and given for the purpose of permitting the bank to avoid having its records show any past due bonds which constituted a misrepresentation which would deceive the creditors of the bank, the State banking authorities and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The District Court in that case held that the petitioner therein was estopped in asserting want of consideration as a defense, whereas Alker is not so estopped. He has the right to prove that Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was not a holder in due course of his note, but only an assignee and pledgee subject to all of Alker's defenses. In *D'Oench Duhme*, the Acts complained of were criminal in nature, Alker was not. There is a finding of no fraud in Alker's case. Alker has not committed any wrongful act. Also, he was the maker of his note whereas in the other case there was only an accommodation note executed. There has never been in the Alker case an understanding that his note would never be enforced. His agreement was only good as long as he did not default on its conditions and for the term of same. Further, the bank examiners' records and reports disclosed to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation their appraised values of Alker's assets, so it could not have been deceived about their value, and the agreement. Nothing was done in the Alker case to conceal any of the facts of his and Mr. DuBan's agreement with the Integrity, so as to hide the truth from the vigilant eyes of the bank examiners. Mr. Matsinger testified that the Integrity's records certainly disclosed to him that there was some kind of agreement between Alker and the Integrity, and, as a matter of fact, the agreement was good banking practice as it provided the Integrity with 1,000 more shares of National

Dairy stock as collateral security for the Alker loan. This testimony is in conflict with Chief Judge Biggs' finding "that the bank examiners who examined the books of the trust company over a period of years found no notation of it. No officer of the trust company made any statement to any examiner that there was an agreement in respect to the Alker loan."

This Court is asked to take notice that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in its complaints did not allege fraud or a secret agreement, and therefore, without having been pleaded, it cannot be asserted in the case.

3. A District Court Trial Judge, Sitting as a Chancellor in Equity, Has the Right to Grant Petitioner a New Trial, to Reach Justice and Equity, Without Obtaining Permission From the Court of Appeals, to Whom the Matter Has Been Appealed and Affirmed by It.

Petitioner contends that a Court of Equity is not restricted to an adjustment of the rights of the parties as they allegedly existed when the suit in equity was brought, but can give relief appropriate to events occurring pending the suit; that equity acts in the present tense and molds its decree to actualities." That such a District Equity Court, even though the matter has been appealed and affirmed, has an inherent right to relieve a party from a judgment tainted by fraud on the Court by an adverse party, or to see that justice and equity is done, particularly when the Chancellor believes the interests of jus' require a new trial and the record discloses that there is a proper basis for such relief; that Rule 60(b) was never intended to deprive a trial judge of his discretionary power to direct a new trial whenever he considered such a course necessary to defeat injustice. It is further submitted that Judge Welsh did not exceed his discretionary authority in granting petitioner a new trial.

> "Where verdict was contrary to right and justice of the case, it was the right and duty of district judge to

set it aside and grant new trial even if there had been sufficient evidence sufficient in law to take case to jury." (*Foreman v. Texas & New Orleans R. Co.*, 205 F. 2d, No. 1, page 79)

Piercing the veneer of phrases, the decisions disclose that federal courts have always exercised broad discretion to right obvious injustices . . . even if technicalities must be twisted to do so—8 Cyc. Fed. Prac. § 3584, and see Moore & Rogers at 688.

4. The Petitioner's Constitutional Rights Were Violated by the Court of Appeals Ordering a Judge, Other Than Judge Welsh (the Trial Chancellor), to Hear Argument on His Motion for a New Trial.

The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides; ". . . no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law . . . ."

Judge Layton in his memorandum opinion states that "Judge Welsh has retired and spends long periods of time each year away from Philadelphia." This may be so, but Judge Welsh was present and available when petitioner's petition asking for rehearing was filed on November 15, 1961, and was still assigned to hearing arguments as well as other matters. It was not until December 4, 1961, Chief Judge Biggs of the Court of Appeals, by order, restricted him to hear only cases of naturalization, uncontested motions, and matters appearing on the Argument List, and, on December 28, 1961, amended said order by limiting Judge Welsh to hearing only naturalization and uncontested motions.

Petitioner contends and submits that the Lower Courts failed to give him equal protection of the laws and due process, or guaranteed him by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, by their ordering Judge Welsh not to hear arguments on cases, which prevented him from hearing petitioner's Motion and in assigning a Judge from another District to hear and rule on the matter.

5. The Lower Court Misinterpreted the Law of Contracts and Its Duty to Ascertain the Definiteness of a Contract When It May Reasonably Be Ascertained From the Facts on Hand and the Circumstances of the Matter.

The trial court's opinion is very uncertain and vague concerning the agreement. The court finds that the parties may have had a "satisfactory understanding," and then holds "the agreement lacks essential definiteness and certainty . . . certainty as to proof and certainty as to time of performance, that is, the limit of restraint" (Appendix, p. 479(a)).

It is contended and submitted by the petitioner that the Lower Court erred in not finding he had a good, lawful binding contract with the Integrity Trust Company, and that their error arose from finding that there was no definite period of duration of the contract stated, and that it must be held void for uncertainty.

Petitioner submits that he has and did present more than sufficient, credible and competent evidence, to prove his agreement with Integrity and DuBan, and also, as to its definiteness of duration. That the Courts failed to take into consideration the testimony of Mr. Santa Marie and Mr. Pellini covering same. Further, that it was the Court's duty to deduce the terms of the agreement from the nature of the subject-matter and the facts presented affecting it. That the Courts should have construed the agreement as to carry into effect the reasonable intention of the parties as it was or could have been ascertained with reasonable certainty.

The petitioner cites the case of *Rossmassler et al. v. Spielberger et al.*, 270 Pa. 40, 41, which states inter alia:

> ". . . Nor is there any real difficulty growing out of the clause under consideration. Appellants' error arises from assuming that because no period of duration is stated, the contract must be held void for uncertainty; where as the Courts will always deduce the term from the nature of the subject-matter, if it is at all

possible so to do. The law does not favor, but leans against the destruction of contracts because of uncertainty. Therefore, the Courts will, if possible, so construe the contract as to carry into effect the reasonable intention of the parties if that can be ascertained. Though there are some formal imperfections in a written contract, still it is sufficient if it contains matter which will enable the Court to ascertain the terms and conditions on which the parties intend to bind themselves. The maxim, 'Id certum est quod certum raddi potest, applies. 6 Ruling Case Law 645.' Apart from contracts which from their inherent nature, imply a power of revocation, it would seem that the intention of the parties to an agreement, that it should be perpetual and without limit as to duration, could not be more properly expressed than by silence as to any time limit or power of revocation. Although there seems to be some authority to the contrary, the rule seems to be that where no limitation is expressed in the agreement, neither party can terminate it without the consent of the other, unless the making of the contract itself indicates with sufficient clearness that the parties must have intended some other determination. . . . ."

and *Kirk, Aplnt. v. Brentwood, M. H., Inc.*, 191 Pa. Superior 492, 493:

". . . It is of course true that, in order for a contract to be enforceable, the agreement of the parties must be sufficiently definite that their intention may be ascertained to a reasonable degree of certainty: Seiss v. McClintic-Marshall Corp., 324 Pa. 201, 188 A. 109. However, 'the law does not require the impossible or impracticable of those who enter into business agreements or transactions; and it is therefore well settled that the terms of a contract need not be expressed with exactness but only with reasonable certainty' . . . ." *Betterman v. American Stores Co.*, 367 Pa. 193.

Oil Creek Twp. Sch. Dist. v. Rome Twp. Sch. District, 2 D. & C. 509, 510, 511 (Pa.):

". . . Furthermore under the decisions of the Appellate Courts of this Commonwealth, it is not the law that because no period of duration is stated, a contract must be held void for uncertainty. This contention came before the Court in the case of Rossmassler et al. v. Spielberger et al., 270 Pa. 31. . . ."

6. Judge Layton, Being a District Judge of Coordinate Jurisdiction Sitting in the Same Court and in the Same Case, and Upon the Same Facts, Should Not Overrule the Original Decision of the Prior Judge, Judge Welsh.

Petitioner contends that Judge Layton could not overrule Judge Welsh's order granting him a new trial in this matter. This contention is based upon the decisions of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in the cases of *United States v. Wheeler*, 256 F. 2d 745; and *T. C. F. Film Corporation v. Gourley*, 240 F. 2d 711.

In the *Wheeler* case the Court states "as we have pointed out, the heart of the matter is whether a second judge may properly entertain the reconsideration at all. We have indicated that if the first judge is available the matter should again be presented to him."

7. As to 12 U. S. C. A. Section 1821(G) It Is Contended That This Act Was Amended by Congress With the Purpose to Prove That Prior to Such Amendment It Was the Intent of Congress That Any Agreement, in the Absence of Fraud, Was Binding on the Corporation.

CONCLUSION.

It is respectfully submitted that in consideration of the foregoing reasons, and in the interest and pursuit of equity and justice, the petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted by this Honorable Court. It is certified that this petition is not filed for delay.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES J. REGAN, JR.,
ROBERT M. TAYLOR,
Attorneys for Petitioner Alker.

Appendix.

DEPOSITION OF LOUIS J. SANTAMARIE DATED DECEMBER 13, 1946.

(2) *

LOUIS J. SANTAMARIE, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Mr. Santamarie, did you in the fall of 1936 visit the Integrity Trust Company at 16th and Walnut Streets in connection with placing a policy of insurance in connection with a loan of Harry J. Alker, Jr., with the Integrity Trust Company?

A. I did.

Q. Whom did you see?

A. I saw Mr. Semish.

Q. Who is Mr. Semish?

A. Mr. Semish was the executive officer in charge of the loans down there.

Q. What took place between you?

A. When I went in there he told me that he was interested in procuring an insurance policy that

(3)

would run ten years, because of the fact that he had a loan that would run that time unless it were paid off sooner.

* Figures in parentheses refer to page numbers of typewritten transcript.

So when I decided the form of insurance, I elected what we call the YRT. It would run for ten years, but in the event of the loan being paid off sooner, the policy could be terminated at a lower cost to the buyer. That was the story in brief, as I remember it.

Q. Did he state whose loan it was?

A. Yes, Harry Alker's.

Q. How did you come to go there?

A. Why, Mr. Alker telephoned me and told me to go down there and arrange for whatever insurance they required to cover this loan.

Q. Repeat again just what he said to you and what you said to him.

A. Well, he told me that they wanted a loan to cover—they wanted an insurance policy to cover a loan that would run ten years, and I told him that I could offer that in the form of an insurance policy which we called a YRT, abbreviating the yearly renewable term, which would run ten years or could be liquidated sooner at the option of the parties

(4)

in interest.

Q. As a result of what he said, what did you do?

A. As a result of that discussion, I produced this ten-year $100,000 policy, which was in turn turned over to Mr. Semish at the Integrity Trust Company. I personally delivered the policy.

Q. What is your business?

A. Life insurance.

Q. How long have you been in that business?

A. I am ashamed to tell you. Since 1905.

Q. Do you specialize in it or do you represent a particular company?

A. I specialize in life insurance. I represent probably ten or fifteen—twenty companies. There are years that I

am licensed by twenty companies and years that I am licensed by only five, depending on the volume of business that is available for distribution among these companies.

Q. Did Semjsh say anything to you about how long the loan was to run?

A. Only in so far that I told you there, that he said this loan would run ten years or less, dependent upon when it was liquidated, but he wanted a policy

(5)

to cover a period of ten years, and that is what I got him. That policy ran exactly ten years and expired by its terms on the 28th day of October, 1946, and it was replaced since that time by another policy issued by the same company for the same amount at an ungodly premium.

I know you feel that, don't you?

Q. You mean the second?

A. The second policy that took the place of the other.

Q. Did he discuss the loan with you? Did he tell you what kind of loan they were making, or anything?

A. He told me it was a collateral loan. No other details that I remember. As my memory serves me, it was a renewal of a loan, because there was another policy which expired at the time, and this policy was taking the place of the one that expired.

Q. Were you in court prepared to testify to that when the case was tried before Judge Welsh?

A. Yes, I was down at the District Court.

Q. You weren't allowed to testify?

A. So I was informed.

Q. Do you know how long the first policy had run?

A. Yes, I do. It was a five-year term.

(6)

Q. You examined that policy yourself?

A. Yes, I examined that policy. It was a five-year term, non renewable, so we had to replace it.

Q. He told you this time it was to be a ten-year?

A. Ten-year term, that is right, and that is what we had.

Mr. Alker: Cross-examine.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. Mr. Santamarie, explain more in detail what a YRT policy is.

A. A YRT policy is what is known as a yearly renewable term. The actual form is it starts off at a low premium rate. It is what is called in terms of life insurance as a natural premium. The natural premium steps up from year to year as the insurance grows older, and so at the tenth year the premium is several times higher than the first year, but in the event of its termination at any time from the first to the tenth year, the insured get out with a lower outlay. Of course, when his premium goes over the fifth year, then he is being punished because he is paying a higher rate than he would have bought had he bought straight term. In other words, it is

an average premium. If the policy was to run twenty years, which would be also on a stepped-up premium every year, that would continue until the twentieth year, when the premium would be at its highest.

Q. So that if the policy were surrendered at the end of a year or two, the insured would save money?

A. That is right.

Q. But if it ran for the full term of ten years, it would cost him more than the level-premium policy?

A. Yes.

Q. Who opened the conversation when you went there?

A. Well, of course, I announced myself as coming there at the suggestion of Mr. Alker for the purpose of arranging whatever insurance they required.

Q. Was there nothing said about which would be cheaper for Mr. Alker?

A. No. I decided upon that since it was a loan that could, if liquidated in the interim from the first to the tenth year, if it could be liquidated in the meantime, he saved money, that is all. That is my duty to the client.

Q. I say, did you discuss the question of cheapness with Mr. Alker in your conversation?

(8)

A. Not that I know of. I selected the form of insurance.

Q. Mr. Semish said that the loan might run ten years?

A. He told me that he wanted the policy to cover a minimum period of ten years.

Mr. Olmsted: That is all.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Who placed the first insurance?

A. I may be in error about the name of the individual, but I think it was a gentleman by the name of Crosby. I didn't handle that transaction. The policy would show the name. The policy always carries the gentleman's name that writes the insurance.

Q. Did Mr. Semish tell you what kind of loans they were making? Did you discuss that with him?

A. Not in detail, except I knew it was a collateral loan, because that happens from time to time in our business that we have to get a policy of insurance to cover a loan at a bank.

Q. Did you discuss the nature of the loan?

A. What do you mean by the nature of it, Mr. Alker?

(9)

Q. Why he wanted the insurance, and so forth?

A. Oh, he wanted to cover the liability that they would be exposed to if anything happened to you before that loan was liquidated?

Q. What do you mean by "liquidated"? Paid off?

A. Paid off. That is the purpose of a life insurance policy accompanying a collateral loan.

Q. To protect them until the loan is paid off?

A. To guarantee the bank that they will be protected until the loan is paid off.

DEPOSITION OF LOUIS SANTAMARIE, JOHN A. BARONE, CHARLES D. MC AVOY, DATED DECEMBER 20, 1946.

(11)

LOUIS J. SANTAMARIE, recalled.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued).

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Mr. Santamarie, you read your testimony given last Friday?

A. Yes.

Q. Does it clearly state what you intended to state about this matter?

A. Yes, with several important exceptions.

Q. What are they?

A. Where the word is used, "liquidate," it was used in error, because what I intended to convey was that this policy was to run for the entire period of ten years unless the loan was repaid sooner by the borrower. I did not intend to give the impression that the bank would have the right to terminate the loan prior to the ten-year period.

(12)

Mr. Alker: Cross-examine.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. What are you reading from, Mr. Santamarie?

A. I read this—I wrote this out myself last night. I read this testimony, and the word "liquidate" seems to convey a misunderstanding. It did in my mind, and I thought it would in your mind or in the mind of the Court.

Q. Have you since the last hearing, have you talked this over with Mr. Alker?

A. No.

Q. How did you happen to come here today, then?

A. Why, he called me—he gave me this and asked me to read it over and see if that is what my intentions were, and the word "liquidate" was the word that I misplaced in it. In other words, liquidate, I have no part in the liquidation of any account. My interest in this matter was insurance only; not liquidation. I had no knowledge of any liquidating facts.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. You came to my office about ten minutes ago, fifteen minutes ago?

By Mr. Olmsted:

(13)

Q. But you did discuss it with Mr. Alker on the telephone?

A. As to the gist of this?

Q. As to the word "liquidate."

A. Yes, the word "liquidate" is in error.

Q. Now, you say in this that you did not intend to give the impression that the bank would have the right to terminate the loan prior to the ten-year period?

A. I have no right to give such an impression.

Q. That's right; you didn't intend to give the contrary impression, either?

A. I didn't intend to give any impression one way or another in that respect.

JOHN A. BARONE, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Mr. Barone, what is your business?

A. Real estate business.

Q. Where are you located?

A. 6451 Frankford Avenue.

Q. And where were you employed from 1930 to 1942?

A. In the office of Harry J. Alker, Jr.

(14)

Q. What was your position there?

Office manager, bookkeeper, and various other duties.

Q. And as such, did you make any visits to the Integrity Trust Company in connection with my loan?

A. I was there quite often in reference to your loan.

Q. Whom did you contact?

A. Mr. Semish.

Q. Who is he?

A. Vice-president. Mr. Antrim and Mr. Fink.

Q. Do you remember any conversations that you had with Mr. Semish, the vice-president, in reference to the loan? What was your object in going there?

A. Well, I handled most of the details of the loan. By that, I mean the insurance payments, payment of interest; any other details necessary to keep the loan in proper shape.

Q. Do you remember any conversations you had with Mr. Semish in reference to the loan the latter part of 1936?

A. Yes, I do. We spoke about it quite often, almost every time I went in the bank, either to make deposits or in reference to the loan. And Mr. Semish and I spoke about the—an agreement whereby the loan was not to be

---

Mr. Olmsted: Just a minute, that isn't

(15)

answering the question.

Mr. Alker: I asked him whether he remembered any conversations in the end of 1936.

The Witness: Yes, sir, as I was saying, why, Mr. Semish and I spoke about it, about Mr. Alker's loan, and what a load he was carrying, and he said at the

time, way back in 1931, we thought Mr. Alker, due to the market and such things, Mr. Alker would be able to pay this thing off by 1936. It looks like we guessed wrong, and I think Mr. Alker is a good, hard-working man, and a good customer of the bank, and I think he can pay this thing off in the next ten years.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Did he say anything about any agreement with me in connection with it?

A. He did say there was an agreement between you and the bank in reference to keeping the loan on the books.

Q. As to the term?

A. That's right, I say, in the next ten years, you may be able to pay it off. As I said before, he thought they had guessed wrongly when they first, when the loan was not paid off by 1936. He figured well, he should be able to pay it off in the next ten years.

Q. Did he say whether or not they had extended it to

(16)

that time?

A. He told me, we will work with him, and I think he will be able to pay it off in ten years.

Q. Did he say anything about an extension? Did he say anything about the life insurance and so forth? You handled that.

A. Oh, at the time in 1936, a five-year term policy expired, and in its place we placed a ten year term policy with the Manufacturers Life, I believe it was.

Q. Who placed that policy?

A. Why, Mr. Santamarie.

Q. Did he discuss it with you at any other times after 1936?

A. Oh, yes, quite often. I mean, as I said before, I used to go in there in reference to deposits, or in reference to the loan, and I stopped by his desk and discussed things in general, and, of course, your loan came up. And in those

conversations he left the impression that nothing would be done, at least for ten years, anyway.

Q. What do yo mean by—what did he say?

A. Well, he says Harry is a good worker, he says—as I said before, he couldn't make it in the last five years due to the fact we guessed wrongly, but I think he will

(17)

be able to clean it up in the next ten years. He can't go wrong for ten years.

Q. Did he say whether or not he had extended it for ten years?

A. I implied from his conversation they did extend it.

Q. What did he say?

A. Well, the impression he gave me was that they wouldn't bother—wouldn't disturb the loan for ten years. That is the impression he gave me from his conversation.

Q. Do you remembr the conference I had with Mr.—with the Integrity on the subject?

A. Mr.——

Q Brown. You weren't present?

A. No, I wasn't present then.

Q. Did you go with me fo the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation after they took over the loan?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And who were present there?

A. Mr. Holl, I believe it was, you and myself.

Q. Who is Mr. Holl?

A. He was the representative of the FDIC.

Q. And where was that?

A. At 16th and Walnut Streets.

Q. And afterwards where?

(18)

A. Then sometime later we had another meeting at 8th and Chestnut Streets.

Q. Down at the old Integrity Trust office?

A. That's right.

Q. And what took place at those meetings?

A. At the first meeting Mr. Holl went over the general condition of the loan, and he left the impression that it was not their intention——

Q. No, don't give me the impressions. What was said?

A. At that time Mr. Holl went over the various securities and so forth, and he said that he would not disturb the loan in any way, and it was not their intention to do so.

Q. What was discussed?

A. The various collateral and so forth, and payments of interest and assigned fees.

Q. Was anything said about the agreement as to when the loan matured?

A. Not a thing was said.

Q. And what was said at the second conference?

A. That conference dealt primarily with the payment of the assigned fees, he wanted to really know what the status was, and you explained to him just what you expected in the near future, and when you thought you

(19)

would be able to pay——

Q. How long after they took that over, did that take place?

A. I don't recall.

Mr. Aiker: Cross-examine.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. Where have you worked since 1942?

A. Well, at Budds, E. G. Budd Manufacturing Company. Then I went in business for myself.

Q. That is, you went from Mr. Alker to Budds?

A. That's right.

any conversations in the end of 1936.

Q. When did you leave Mr. Alker?

A. In March, 1942.

Q. And when did you leave Budds?

A. In June, 1945.

Q. Where were you employed, right up here in North Philadelphia?

A. No.

Q. In Philadelphia?

A. Red Lion plant up in Bustleton.

Q. Where did you live at that time?

A. At 4134 Barnett Street.

Q. Do you still live there?

(20)

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know when this conference that you speak of at 16th and Walnut Street took place?

A. I beg your pardon?

Q. Do you know when this conference took place?

A. Not very long after the Integrity was taken over by the FDIC.

Q. Do you remember which room you had your conference in?

A. It was in the room on the right-hand side going in the door, in the corner room.

Q. Are you sure it was Mr. Holl you talked to?

A. I thought it was.

Q. Well, do you stick to that testimony, that it was Mr. Holl?

A. At least I thought it was Mr. Holl. I don't recall whether any changes were made or not.

Q. Were you introduced to him as Mr. Holl?

A. I think I was.

Q. If your recollection could be wrong about that, it could be wrong about the conversation, too?

A. No, sir.

Q. It could not?

A. It may be wrong about the party I spoke to, but the

(21)

conversation I recall clearly.

Q. Now, down at 8th and Chestnut, who did you talk to there?

A. I assume it was Mr. Holl.

Q. Was it the same person?

A. I thought it was. I mean, it has been six, seven years.

Q. Well, six or seven years——

A. Either way, it was a party representing the FDIC whom I spoke to with Mr. Alker.

Q. Well, do you remember whether it was the same person in both cases?

A. I thought it was. I may be wrong there, but as I said before, it was a party representing the FDIC.

Q. It was six or seven years ago?

A. Oh, five years ago.

Q. Five years ago. So that your recollection could be faulty in that regard?

A. That's right, yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Barone, were you subpoenaed to testify in Mr. Alker's case in 1944?

A. No, sir.

Mr. Olmsted: That is all.

Mr. Alker: That is all.

---

(22)

CHARLES D. McAVOY, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Mr. McAvoy, where do you live?

A. South Ardmore, Delaware County.

Q. Mr. McAvoy, did you in the latter part of 1936 have any conversation with Mr. Semish, the vice-president of the Integrity Trust Company in connection with my loan?

A. Yes, I had occasion to stop in your office on other business and you asked me to deliver a check of interest payment on the loan which you had with the Integrity Trust Company, and I delivered same to Mr. Semish, I presume the vice-president, and he handed the check over to the clerk, and while he was making out the receipt, I said to Mr. Semish, I said, "My God" I said, "that is some interest to pay, isn't it?"

And he said, "It certainly is."

And I said, "Well, what rate is that?"

And he said, "Well, this is presently a five. It was six." He said, "We reduced it on our own accord."

And I said, "Bankers don't generally do that, do they?"

And he said, "Well, Mr. Alker has been a

(23)

friend of the bank. He brought in a great deal of deposit accounts, and he also brought in a lot of title business."

And I said, "Well, how long has this been going on?" I did make a reference about something, which I cannot repeat here, about his income tax return. And we often wondered, I said, down in the office the man would pay that much interest the year. So he said that, he said, "Mr. Alker has had this loan for some years, and we just renewed it for a period of ten years," and he said, "Under no conditions would we sell out the collateral. We had an oral agreement with the other officers and himself, with Mr. Alker, and the Trust Company has a lot of respect for Mr. Alker and knew that he would not let it go to default," and they had an arrangement that they would never sell out the collateral as long as he kept up the interest payments. And I don't know, I made some offhand remark that, I don't know just what I said, I

wouldn't want to carry that load, or something like that, and he said, "We are fully protected; we have an insurance policy of," I think 100 or 125,000, and he said, "He has some good friends," and so on.

Q. He told you definitely that they had extended the loan for ten years?

A. Yes, he said they just had extended it from, I

(24)

think five, previously, to ten.

Q. Did you ever have any other conversations with him?

A. Well, no, I was only in there two or three occasions as I remember, and I only went over there on your account, and then sometimes I went to the Title Company, but I never stopped in.

Mr. Alker: Cross-examine.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. What was your occupation in 1936?

A. Internal revenue.

Q. Well, what do you mean by that?

A. Well, I mean by that I was employed by internal revenue.

Q. You mean in the federal government?

A. Yes.

Q. At the time you took this over for Mr. Alker, you were an employee of it?

A. United States Internal Revenue, right.

Q. How long did you remain in that?

A. Remain in what?

Q. In the United States Department of Revenue?

A. Well, I am still in the internal revenue. I have been off on a sick leave, understand, for the last four-

(25)

teen months. I had very high blood pressure last week, and I suffered a hemorrhage, but for about three days.

Q. Where is your office?

A. Where is my office? You know where internal revenue is, I hope, in Philadelphia, 9th and Chestnut Streets.

Q. You are not in the Gimbel Building?

A. I am not in either building. I was sick for the past fourteen months. I have been on leave from the United States Internal Revenue, sick leave. Prior to that I worked out of the 69th Street office for the last two years. In 1936 I was employed as an auditor, income tax division, internal revenue, 9th and Chestnut Streets.

Q. And when were you at 69th Street?

A. About two years before my fourteen months off. You figure that out.

Q. That would be from 1943 to 1945?

A. Pardon me?

Q. That would be from 1943 to 1945?

A. It is May 19, 1945, I was taken sick with the stroke, was paralyzed.

Q. And for about two years before that you were——

A. Stationed—approximately two years before that, stationed at 69th Street.

Q. Where at 69th Street?

(26)

A. The McClatchey Building, Room 417, assigned a deputy in the field. I worked in internal revenue since 1933, and prior to that I have served under the Woodrow Wilson administration for a couple of years.

Q. Were you subpoenaed in this case?

A. I was threatened to be subpoenaed.

Q. Well, were you subpoenaed?

A. No, but I was going to be subpoenaed if I didn't.

Q. No; I don't mean for this testimony today.

A. Oh.

Q. No, I mean back in 1944.

A. In 1944 what?

Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify in this case?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever communicated with anybody in the FDIC about this case?

A. I spoke to nobody in the FDIC. I spoke to your associate or employer, whatever he is, Mr. Saul.

Q. Anybody else?

A. And then he put you on the phone, I spoke to you.

Q. Anybody else?

A. Now, let me think. I mean if I spoke to anybody else in your office?

Q. Well, in the FDIC, I am talking about now.

(27)

A. I spoke to Mr. Holl on occasions, but in regards to Mr. Alker. I spoke—if you want to know, I will tell you—I spoke to him on the sale of the property and where they squeezed it out——

Q. It didn't concern Mr. Alker?

A. No, it didn't have anything to do with this.

Q. Did you speak with anybody in the FDIC concerning Mr. Alker's matter?

A. Not that I recall. In fact, I don't know anybody down at FDIC personally.

Mr. Olmsted: That is all.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Your family has been a client of our office for quite some years, isn't that a fact?

A. Oh, definitely, and besides, Mr. Alker has been very helpful to friends of mine when they needed mortgages and

so on, and went over the Integrity on settlements. I recall quite a few properties.

Q. You had occasion from time to time——

A. To stop in and see you in regards to those mortgages, I merely went up there, and Mr. Alker would chase anybody out on an errand, if he was busy.

Q. You just happened to be there when I asked you to take it over; there was nobody else to take it?

(28)

A. That's right.

Mr. Alker: Cross-examine.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. Mr. McAvoy, you say you talked to me about the case?

A. On the phone, I wanted that understood. I spoke to Mr. Saul.

Q. What did you say?

A. Oh, I don't know, I think I called you all the bastards in the world and you called me all the bastards in the world. I think that is the conversation, generally, I think it was.

Q. The first part is true, but not the second part. Didn't you threaten me?

A. Threaten you? God damn it, you were threatening everybody. You were holding the cards, not me. How could I threaten you?

Q. All right.

A. But I did ask Mr. Saul to do us a favor and take it easy on account of bygone days, I did. Then he turned me over to you, and that was that. But I don't remember any conversation we had except asking for further indulgence in the collection of those, I think dividends.

(29)

wasn't it? It was around March 15th one year, and I couldn't even leave the office; just we were standing up there at the counter and busy as the devil. I apologize for my part of the bastards.

Q. If it would interest you, it is a word I don't use.

A. Oh, pardon me. Well, you might have said son of a bitch, then. I don't know what it was.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Olmsted: I have not objected to any of the testimony on the ground of admissibility or the impropriety of the motion which has been made, and in support of which this testimony is being taken, on the theory that the proper place to make such objections are when they are offered in Court. I think it well to make it clear at this point that I am not waiving these objections, as to me it seems very clear that all of this is entirely incompetent.

Mr. McCracken: Well, that is thoroughly understood.

DEPOSITION OF CHARLES B. MATSINGER AND JOHN PELLINI, DATED JANUARY 16, 1947.

(31)

CHARLES B. MATSINGER, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. What is your name?

A. Charles B. Matsinger.

Q. What is your present address?

A. Residence or business?

Q. Business.

A. 360 North Hampton Street, Easton.

Q. What was your occupation in 1937 and 1938?

A. State bank examiner.

Q. Did you at that time during any of those years in the 30's examine the Integrity Trust Company?

A. Sometime in the late 30's. I wouldn't want to be positive of the year.

Q. How many years did you make the examination? Just the one?

A. No, either two or three.

Q. Were you familiar with the loan of Harry J. Alker, Junior, at the bank at that time?

A. There were such loans there at that time.

Q. Did you have any discussion about that loan with any of the officers of the bank?

A. Yes.

(32)

Q. Do you remember who the officers were?

A. I wouldn't want to say definitely, but we discussed things of that kind with Mr. Brown, Mr. Semish and possibly Mr. Hogan.

Q. Do you remember whether or not there was brought to your attention any agreement of mine with the trust company relating to that loan?

A. As far as I can recall now in our discussions with the officers they gave us information that would lead us to believe they had some——

Mr. Olmsted: Wait a minute. Just a minute. You aren't answering Mr. Alker's question. Just start again and don't state hearsay. Just state what you know and what you did.

The Witness: What I say, as far as I can recall, in discussing those loans with them, they indicated that there was some sort or kind of agreement between them.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Did you report that to the state in your report?

A. Well, I can't tell you just exactly what was in the reports now, but I would believe that there would be reference to that in our reports.

Q. You do know that they did state to you that there was some sort of an agreement relating to my loan?

(33)

Mr. Olmsted: Objected to as leading.

Mr. Alker: Of course we couldn't expect you eight years later to remember the details.

Mr. Olmsted: I also object to the other one as not being the best evidence. The report itself would be the best evidence.

Mr. Alker: You can't get those.

Mr. Olmsted: You can subpoena those.

Mr. Alker: I was told you couldn't. I have been trying to.

(The following question was read by the Reporter: "Question: You do know that they did state to you that there was some sort of an agreement relating to my loan?")

Mr. Olmsted: Objected to as leading.

A. Do you want me to answer that?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. To the best of my knowledge, I believe they did.
Q Do you remember what they said to you?
A. No, I couldn't.
Q. I don't mean in plain words, but substantially what they advised you.
A. No, that would be impossible for me to remember that now.
Q. What led up to the discussion?

(34)

A. In the course of an examination the examiners were supposed to take up with the officers and discuss all loans. The only reason that I can remember that loan now is that it was an awfully large sized one. We discussed all loans with the officers and got all information that it was possible to get.
Q. Did you notice anything different between the collateral of this loan and any other loan? I mean, do you recall?
A. I can't even recall what collateral was there now.
Q. Did you discuss with the officers of the bank each loan as to which there was any question in your mind?
A. We always did.
Q. You don't know me, of course?
A. No.

Q. I mean I never met you before this?

A. No.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. Where do you now live?

A. My residence?

Q. Yes.

A. 227 West Lafayette Street, Easton.

Q. How long were you in the State Banking Department?

A. From November 1, 1929, to November 15, 1943.

(35)

Q. Where did you live in 1943?

A. Prior to my moving to Easton I lived at 4835 Morris Street, Germantown.

Q. Philadelphia?

A. Yes.

Q. Where did you live in 1943? Will you state that more specifically?

A. 1943?

Q. Yes.

A. At the Morris Street address, 4835.

Q. When did you move to Easton?

A. I went to Easton November 15, 1943, and my family moved there on January 17, 1944.

Q. You have lived there continuously since then?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your present occupation?

A. Executive vice-president of the Lafayette Trust Company.

Q. At 360 North Hampton Street is the address?

A. Is the business address.

Q. Is the address of the Lafayette Trust Company the Hampton Street address?

A. Yes.

Q. You don't remember whether you talked to Mr. Semish, Mr. Brown or someone else?

(36)

A. No, I couldn't tell you which one.

Q. Mr. Semish didn't say that he had made any arrangement with Mr. Alker, did he?

A. I can't tell you if anyone said definitely, but in our conversations the fact of an agreement of some kind was brought up, and who said it I wouldn't be able to tell you today.

Q. At page 271a of the printed record, folio 302, appears the following: This is a question addressed to Mr. Semish and his answer.

> "Q. Did you at any time have any conversations with Mr. Alker or Mr. Fisher concerning the calling of the loan or the selling of the collateral?
>
> "A. I never did."

Did Mr. Semish tell you anything inconsistent with that testimony?

A. That I couldn't answer.

Q. You don't remember that he did?

A. I don't remember he did and I don't remember he didn't.

Q. At page 273a of the printed record appears the following question addressed to Mr. Brown and his answer:

> "Q. Yes, and was there any reference made at that time to an alleged agreement concerning the sale of the collateral?
>
> "A. There is no agreement insofar as I could

(37)

> ascertain by having asked Mr. Hart specifically about it. There were no indications in the records among the assets or with respect to this particular note as to any agreement existing."

Did Mr. Brown tell you anything inconsistent with that testimony?

A. There again I can't answer you. I can't remember who said it at the time.

Q. Did you find any written reference in the records of the bank about any agreement concerning Mr. Alker's loan?

A. Again I can't remember of anything. It has been too long ago.

Q. You cannot remember whether or not you did find anything?

A. No.

Q. If you had found anything you would have reported it in your report, wouldn't you?

A. If it were pertinent information?

Q. Yes.

A. It would be reported.

Q. What became of your report after you completed it?

A. Sent to Harrisburg.

Q. Did you have anything more to do with it after that?

A. No.

Q. You signed it, I presume?

(38)

A. I signed it after it was typed. After it was all typed and signed and sent to Harrisburg that is the end of it, as far as the examiners are concerned.

Q. Were you subpenaed to testify in this case?

A. When?

Q. In 1944.

A. No.

Q. Were you subpenaed to testify at this time?

A. Mr. Alker asked me if I would appear here today.

Q. He didn't ask you to do that in 1944?

A. No.

Mr. Alker: I didn't know he existed.

Mr. Olmsted: That is all.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. Mr. Brown on page 273a in answer to a question by Mr. Olmsted, "Did you discuss this matter with the bank examiners?

"A. I did."

Could you have been one of the examiners with whom he discussed it? He was asked, "Did you yourself make any such agreement?"

He said, "I never did."

Of course the agreement wasn't made by him.

(39)

"Did you discuss this matter with the bank examiners?

"Answer: I did."

Could you have been one of the examiners he was referring to then or couldn't you tell at this time?

A. I don't know what Mr. Brown had in his mind.

Q. I mean the examiners. How many examiners were there?

A. As far as the examinations were concerned there would be only one representing the state and one representing the Federal Reserve Bank in Philadelphia and in those years, in the years that I was there I would be the one he would be referring to.

Q. That is right. If it wasn't one of those years when you wouldn't be?

A. That is right.

Mr. Alker: That is all.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. Just while you are on that, the next question after the one Mr. Alker read to you is as follows:

"Q. Did you tell the bank examiner that there was such an agreement?

"A. I never did."

Now, are you testifying in contradiction to that

(40)

that Mr. Brown did tell you there was an agreement?

A. I wouldn't want to say that Mr. Brown told us definitely that there was an agreement.

Q. Have you read the testimony in this case?

A. No, sir.

Q. You aren't familiar with the testimony that was given by the other bank examiners?

A. I didn't know there was even a case came to trial on it.

Q. Do you know Mr. George I. Taylor?

A. George Taylor?

Q. Charles I. Taylor.

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know him?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you make any examinations of the Integrity Trust Company along with him?

A. Yes, I believe that was made in 1940.

Q. Did you join in the examination on the basis of which the Integrity Trust Company was closed?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know Mr. Hobart B. Dietz?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you make any examinations with him into the Integrity Trust Company?

(41)

A. I believe I did.

Q. Do you know Mr. Martin J. Levin?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you make any bank examinations of the Integrity Trust Company in company with him?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you familiar with the fact that all three of them testified that they found no reference to this among the written records of the bank?

Mr. Alker: I object to that.

Mr. Olmsted: Just a minute.

Q. (Continuing) —and that nothing was said to them about this alleged agreement at the time they interviewed the officers of the bank?

Mr. Alker: I object to that because the testimony doesn't so state.

A. I don't know anything they may have said because this is the first time that I have known—just a few days ago is the first knowledge I had of any case, law suit or anything else concerning this loan.

Q. Mr. Alker didn't let you see this testimony before you came here?

A. No, sir.

Q. You mean to contradict the testimony that they gave?

(42)

Mr. Alker: I object to that because the testimony doesn't so show.

A. I haven't said that I saw a written agreement or anything at all in regard to any writing either on the records or presented by any officer of the Integrity Trust

Company. I simply said that in discussing this loan—the only place that I said anything at all concerning any agreement was that in discussing this loan the officers verbally indicated that there was some agreement with Mr. Alker. What that agreement is I don't know now.

Mr. Olmsted: That is all.

JOHN PELLINI, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Alker:

Q. What is your name?

A. John Pellini.

Q. What is your address?

A. My present address is 223 East Main Street, Pennsgrove, New Jersey.

Q. Where were you employed in 1937 or some years before and some years afterwards?

A. From 1934 to 1943 I was employed by Mr. Alker.

Q. In what capacity?

(43)

A. Well, I started out as a runner there and I finally wound up as officer manager taking care of the books, paying all bills, and all general office work.

Q. Did you on any occasions go to the Integrity Trust Company in reference to my loan?

A. Yes, sir, I did, on many occasions. Mr. Perrone and I both used to go. If he was busy on something I would go to the Integrity to pay the note, which was every month.

Q. Pay the interest?

A. That is right, sir, pay the interest on that note.

Q. Did you know any of the officers over there?

A. Oh, yes, I knew Mr. Brown, Mr. Winterbottom,—he was up in the real estate department—Mr. Conger, Mr. Semish.

Q. Did you have any conversations with any of those officers about my loan about 1937?

A. Yes, I did, with Mr. Semish, because he was the man I used to take the check to, and he would give it to a clerk to go in and get my receipt, and quite often I would sit and talk to him, and I can recall a number of times I told him it was quite a heavy load that Mr. Alker was carrying. He said it was, but they had a lot of faith in Mr. Alker for the simple reason he had been paying his interest. He had an insurance policy. He had some sort of collateral against the loan. They had faith in him for the simple reason they

(44)

knew Mr. Alker would eventually pay it off as soon as the market became better. We used to talk about that because the interest was so large, about $2,500 a month plus the insurance I used to pay as collateral on that loan. As I can recall there was one insurance which had been extended from 1936 to 1946 which Mr. Semish had told me about, because I told him we were still paying the premium on it.

He said, "Yes, the insurance policy had been renewed for the simple reason they had agreed to continue the loan of Mr. Alker, to extend it, a continuation for ten more years. That is why they had renewed that policy. I was kind of happy about the whole thing because I knew how hard it was for Mr. Alker at times to get up that $2,500 a month.

Q. Did you know the date to which he said the loan was extended?

A. I think that was about 1937. He said it would go to 1946. It would go for ten more years.

Q. Where have you been since February 1, 1943?

A. I have been in the army from about the first week of February up until the end of 1945.

Q. Where were you?

A. I was overseas most of the time.

Q. You just got back in 1945?

A. That is right, sir.

(45)

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. Did you say you kept Mr. Alker's books?

A. John Perrone kept most of the books and I helped him on the books. Mr. Perrone left in 1941 and I continued on from there on in.

Q. Were you familiar with the books?

A. I was quite familiar with them.

Q. It was a fact that the dividends that Mr. Alker received from the stocks that were pledged as collateral exceeded the amount of the interest?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. You don't know whether it is so or not?

A. No, I don't because I never for the simple reason —what stocks do you mean? The stocks that were pledged as collateral?

Mr. Olmsted: I would like the record to show that Mr. Alker spoke to this witness in the middle of his answer.

By Mr. Olmsted:

Q. Don't pay any attention to Mr. Alker's statement and listen to me. You said you were office manager at the end and kept the books.

A. Yes, to a certain extent.

Q. Are you familiar with the dividends that were payable to

(46)

Mr. Alker?

A. No, not all of them, no, sir. I wasn't familiar. At the present I couldn't remember, to be truthful with you, about those dividends.

Q. You don't know then whether or not the dividends that he received were greater or less than the amount of interest that he paid?

A. No. I wouldn't know, sir.

Q. Did you make out his income tax return?

A. No, sir, I didn't. He took care of them himself.

Mr. Olmsted: That is all.

EXCERPT FROM DEPOSITION OF JOHN M. PELLINI DATED JANUARY 26, 1962.

(5)

JOHN M. PELLINI, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. What is your full and correct name?

A. John M. Pellini.

Q. Where do you reside?

A. 828 North 63rd Street.

Q. Are you employed?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. And what is your employment?

A. I am a heavy construction equipment salesman.

Q. By whom are you employed?

A. Service Supply Corporation, 20th and Erie Avenue.

Q. How long have you been employed by this firm?

A. About a year.

Q. And previous to that employment by whom were you employed?

A. I was on my own as an equipment broker.

Q. And before you went into business for yourself by whom were you employed?

A. How far back do you want me to go?

Q. Well, I want to go back to when you were discharged from the Army.

A. Well, I was dicharged from the Army——

(6)

Q. Well, before you went into business for yourself.

A. Before I went into business I was employed by Mr. Alker.

Q. You mean Harry J. Alker, Jr., one of the defendants in this case?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When were you first employed by Mr. Alker?

A. 1934.

Q. And what were your duties then?

A. I was assistant to John Barone who was the office manager.

Q. What were your duties?

A. General office work with John on the books, taking care of the books, making all deposits and general work running the City Hall and taking care of Mr. Alker's personal problems. Things of that sort as an assistant to John handling all of Mr. Alker's matters pertaining to the office and personal.

Q. How long were you in Mr. Alker's employ?

A. How long was I?

Q. Yes.

A. I went into service in February '43. From '34 to '43.

Q. You went from his employment right into service?

A. That's right, sir.

Q. What service were you in?

A. United States Army.

Q. Can you tell us what part of the Army you were in?

(7)

A. Yes. I was in a service supply outfit overseas until August '45.

Q. When did you go overseas?

A. I went overseas in '43. I think it was October or November, November '43.

Q. And you were not in the United States or available to be a witness at this trial in April 1944, at the trial of this case?

A. No.

Q. Were you hororably discharged from the Army?

A. Yes.

Q. When?

A. September '45.

Q. And did you go right back to employment with anyone?

A. Yes, right back with Mr. Alker.

Q. And how long did you work with him then?

A. With Mr. Alker until about '50, 1950, and went out on my own for two years. Then Mr. Alker asked me to come back with him and I was back here until '57. I think it was '57.

Q. What is your age?

A. 48.

Q. Pursuant to your duties with Mr. Alker in Mr. Alker's employment did you have anything to do with any loans of his?

A. Yes.

(8)

Q. Will you tell us?

A. Well, in particular I used to make the payment, interest payment, every month to the Integrity Trust Company.

Q. Whose loan was this?

A. Personal loan of Mr. Alker's.

Q. Will you tell us what you know about that?

A. I used to take over the interest on that loan every month in the neighborhood—it used to range from $2,200 to $2,500 every month. It was the interest of his personal loan with Integrity.

Q. Do you know how much the loan or loans were?

A. I think it was around a half million dollars, in that neighborhood.

Q. What else did you do about it?

A. Well, I knew the question came up for the renewal of the notes, the renewal of the loan.

Q. Tell us how you knew it and what you knew, and when.

A. Well, in that particular that was—the original loan was made—I wasn't here when the original was made in '31. He called me in.

Q. Who?

A. Mr. Alker called John Barone and I into the office and told us that the bank examiners wanted new notes made up over there on the loan.

(9)

Q. Over where?

A. At Integrity Trust Company. He had told me to go over to pick up the new notes, to bring them here to the office so he could sign them.

Q. Was it note or notes?

A. Note.

Q. When you went over there what transpired and who did you see if you remember?

A. Well, it was the assistant to the president there. He used to sit right outside of the president's office. The president at that time used to be Semich.

Q. Was he president?

A. I don't remember if he was president. At this time I am fairly certain he was president.

Mr. White: Do you want to spell the name.

A. S-e-m-i-c-h, I think.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. Can you locate the office in the building?

A. Yes. As you went into the building it was on the right-hand side there.

Q. On the first floor?

A. First floor, that's right.

Q. Where was the office located?

A. On the right-hand side.

(10)

Q. In the corner?

A. In the corner.

Q. I don't mean to lead.

A. No, in a corner there. In other words, as you went in on the right-hand side, on your right-hand side back in this corner.

Q. This is at 16th and Walnut?

A. That's right.

Q. Did you go into the main office, or who did you see?

A. I had gone in to see—I brought it in to the president. Mr. Alker gave me instructions to go in to pick up the note from the president, and he sent me outside to his assistant.

Q. And was that Semich, the assistant, or if you don't remember or don't recollect don't give a name.

A. I don't remember who it was, but I knew it was the president because he told me to go direct.

Q. But you dealt with the man outside?

A. That's right.

Q. Could you recognize that man if you ever saw him?

A. Probably could. It has been years, but I used to see him so frequently. I used to be over there on the minimum twice a day at the Integrity.

Q. What occurred on this visit?

A. I was to pick up the new note.

(11)

Q. Can you give us a date?

A. That was in '36, around December '36. I was to pick up a new note. The bank examiners wanted that new note, I sat down there talking to him and he didn't have the new note prepared.

Q. You mean the man outside?

A. Yes, the president's assistant there. I happened to see the old notes were there. I saw those and he said he would have the new notes made up and I had to wait while they were filled in, the new note. So, I picked that up. He

gave it to me and I took it over here to Mr. Alker for his signature.

Q. Did you read the note?

A. Yes, I read the note.

Q. Did you examine it?

A. Yes.

Q. How much was it for, if you remember?

A. It was over $500,000 I know that.

Q. Do you remember any wording on it?

A. I do remember the notations on the note itself because there was a list of collateral and notation on the back about Walter K. Hardt on an agreement, in regards to an agreement they had with Walter K. Hardt who used to be president one time of the Integrity when the original loan was granted.

Q. This was the original note?

A. Yes.

(12)

Q. That Mr. Alker signed or executed in 1931, I assume.

A. Yes.

Mr. Bull: No, he is talking about the note he brought back.

A. Yes, the note I brought back.

Mr. Taylor: I withdraw that.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. What did you do with the new note?

A. I took it to Mr. Alker. He signed it, and I took it down and showed it to A. A. Du Ban downstairs.

Q. May I ask you this before you talk about that? Did you have any conversation with the man that gave you the note about the contents?

A. Yes. I asked him if everything was all right as to collateral and he said, yes. Everything is all right. I said,

what happens on the insurance? Is the Integrity renewing the insurance because I knew there was quite a policy on that, a term policy. He said, yes. They had ordered the insurance from Mr. Santa Maria, a ten-year policy. Therefore, the note would continue the same along with the insurance policy.

Q. Did you have any conversation with that man?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. About what was typed on the note?

A. Oh, yes, as to regards—I had said to him that note

(13)

there, the old note had the list of collateral plus the notations on it. There were notations on the back as to an agreement because Mr. Alker had definitely impressed me with that that everything had to be on the new note also.

Q. Did you see the old note at that time?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. And that was on the old notes?

A. Yes, sir, on both notes. It had been put on the new note. I examined it before I walked away from his desk.

Q. Do you know if it was done at that time?

A. Well, I had to sit there and wait for it. So, no doubt it was done at that time.

Q. You are only concluding now. Do you know? Did you see it put on there?

A. Well, it had been on the new note when it was given to me to take to Mr. Alker.

Q. How about the old notes?

A. The same notation was on the old notes, whatever notations were on the back and all.

Mr. Taylor: Here are photostats. The originals are filed in Court. I will attach them to the deposition.

Mr. Bull: I think that is within the scope of the objection which we reserved.

(14)

Mr. Taylor: All right.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. I show you two photostatic instruments, or photographed instruments. Do they help refresh your memory, or do you know what they are?

A. Yes, I certainly do. These are the old notes.

Q. They are the old notes, or copies?

A. They are copies, photostats of the old note.

Q. And can you read what is on the back of the notes?

A. This is a list of payments, deductions. The collateral plus the notation, Mr. Alker's signature on the back there plus, "For additional collateral and agreement with Alker and A. A. Du Ban see WKH "

Q. That is on each of the notes?

A. It is on the back of just one of them.

Q. Isn't it on the other one?

A. Yes. It is on the other one also where the collateral is listed.

Q. Was that wording on the notes when you saw them in the bank's office?

A. Yes, sir, because I happened to know why that was on there because it was Mr. Du Ban's collateral. It was Mr. Du Ban's stock.

Q. Did you have any conversation with anyone at the bank

(15)

about the wording?

A. Yes, sir. I did because I knew that was very important. It had to be on the new notes. What was here on the old notes here had to be on the new one.

Q. With whom did you have conversation?

A. That is the assistant there. The president's assistant when I went in to pick up the new note.

Q. What was your conversation?

A. The conversation as to the wording there and as to the insurance policy.

Q. Did he tell you why it was there?

A. Yes. He said it had been put there because of the additional collateral and agreement made with Walter K. Hardt.

Q. Who was he?

A. President at the time that agreement was made.

Q. You brought the new note back to Mr. Alker's office?

A. That's right.

Q. Then what happened?

A. Mr. Alker signed it and I was to take it back to the bank, but first to take it down and show it to Mr. Du Ban.

Q. Who told you to do that?

A. Mr. Alker, and I took it and showed it to Mr. Du Ban. He O. K.'d it, said everything was in shape the way it should be, and I took it back to the bank and gave it to the assistant who

(16)

had given it to me to be signed. I asked for the old notes and he said he had put the old notes away. I was in a bit of a quandary for a while. I didn't want to leave the new note and he have the old one, but knowing the amount of business going back and forth between our office and the bank I knew they would send us the note, or I would pick it up.

Q. As the result of that what did you do?

A. Well, I came back and I told Mr. Alker that I did not have the old notes because they had put the old notes away. Everything was O. K. I had delivered the new note, and he told me the insurance policy had been ordered through Santa Maria, a ten-year term policy. I made a notation with Mr. Alker on my own records to follow up to get him back the old notes.

Q. Note or notes?

A. Note.

Q. The old note?

A. The old note, that's right.

Q. Were there one or two notes?

A. There were two.

Q. And as far as you are concerned, and the best of your recollection, these are exact copies of the notes as they were returned to Mr. Alker?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, did Mr. Alker ever receive the old notes?

(17)

A. Yes, we received them.

Q. Who received them?

A. They came in the mail. I always opened his mail every morning at 8:00 o'clock, and had it ready for him. To be truthful I was pestering about these notes because I knew I was responsible for getting the old note back. It finally came in the mail about five or six weeks later.

Q. When would that——

A. That would be in the middle of January or so '37.

Q. Some time in January?

A. Right.

Q. You say you opened the mail?

A. Every morning, yes, sir.

Q. And the notes were in the mail?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you do with them?

A. I put those on top and waited until he came in, and I showed him the notes, the old notes were back and I was filing them.

Q. Did he examine them? Did you examine them?

A. Yes, sir. He examined them and I examined them.

Q. And that is the way they were?

A. That is exactly the way they were.

Q. What did you do with them?

(18)

A. Well, I filed them, and inadvertently I was the guy that caused all the trouble, no doubt. Mr. Alker's file was No. 1, File A. We had an adoption file in front of his, and that is where I put them by mistake.

Q. That would be some time in the latter part of January 1937?

A. '37, that's right, sir.

Q. And then what happened?

A. We went on our normal business, kept making the payment of the interest to the bank every month.

Q. Then what happened?

A. Then in '43 I went into the service.

Q. Nothing else happened as to the notes?

A. No, nothing else occurred. I just put them in the file.

Q. Then you went in the service, and then what?

A. While I was in the service Mr. Alker wrote me that the F. D. I. C. had closed him out. There was nothing I could do about it. I was overseas. In fact I used to get my mail maybe two or three months late. Many a time I didn't get paid for two months. They couldn't catch up with us. As soon as I got back I came in to see Mr. Alker and he told me about the suit being on with the F. D. I. C. We had to find the old notes. So, I went to work on it and I couldn't find the old notes around here because we always used to close out our file, the dead

(19)

files, and take them up to Norristown and put them in storage up there. I spent about a week up in Norristown and found the old notes in the adoption file.

Q. What did you do with them?

A. Immediately brought them in to Mr. Alker.

Q. And is this the first time you have been examined on them in a deposition?

A. No. There was one other deposition before.

Q. That is the one that Mr. Bull referred to?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You weren't examined as to the notes though, were you?

A. The notes themselves, no, sir.

Q. What was your rank in the Navy? You were in the Navy or Army?

A. Army.

Q. What was your rating or rank?

A. I was discharged as a corporal. I was in the service in 1931 and I was in a military college. We were a military intelligence group.

Mr. Taylor: That's all.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Bull:

Q. How long ago was it, Mr. Pellini, that this episode to which you have just testified took place? Did you figure it

(20).

out?

A. Which episode is that, sir?

Q. The exchange of the old notes for the new notes, it was in '36?

A. Well, that was in '36.

Q. That is 25 years?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what have you refreshed your recollection of this transaction from?

A. By the affidavit I had taken, sir.

Q. In other words, you read over your old affidavit?

A. Oh, yes, sir.

Q. And it is on the basis of that you are giving your present testimony?

A. Yes. It refreshed it because—it was such a large amount of money and knowing that the F. D. I. C. case was going on all the time while I was here—it was kept fresh in my memory. Let me put it that way.

Q. And you worked with Mr. Alker off and on until——

A. '57, sir.

Q. —'57?

A. Yes.

Q. And have you seen him since occasionally, kept up with him?

(21)

A. Yes, I have occasionally, sir.

Q. And you have discussed this deposition with him?

A. No, not the deposition. The only thing I discussed, he asked me if I remember my affidavit. I said, yes. I remember my affidavit.

Q. Who suggested that you search for the old notes?

A. Ed Hall.

Q. And approximately when was this?

A. Well, I didn't come back into the office until the latter part of '45 or the first month of '46. The latter part of '45 because I took about a month or so off before coming back to work, but I know I didn't find those doggone notes for six months or so. I went through every file in Norristown, every individual file I went through. I knew it was important. That was my orders, find those notes. They had been filed and that was it. I went through every blessed file in that building.

Q. And it was by going through every file that you finally found it?

A. That's right, and I found it in the adoption file.

Q. And when you say in Norristown that was in Mr. Alker's house in Norristown?

A. Yes, sir. That is where we stored the old records, all the old files.

Q. You think this was about six months after you came back

(22)

in '45?

A. It might have been a little longer, more like a year. Right around a year's time. I know it was no sooner than six months, and more like a year.

Q. You were discharged, you say, in September?

A. '45, sir.

Q. So, you would say this had been found about September of '46?

A. No, no. A couple of years intervening there. I am of the opinion, if I can recall correctly, because I couldn't spend all my time out there. I used to go out there maybe a day a week, or on a Sunday. It might have been within a couple of years by the time I went through all those files.

Q. What did you do, go through every file?

A. Every blessed file I went through.

Q. Did you start with Mr. Alker's file?

A. Yes. I started with Mr. Alker's file and I went through all the estates, everything, every file over there. The adoption file was, from what I can recall, the adoption file was back and forth. I know they still do it. He used to before sometimes we would bring in old files and usually if you are looking for something it is the last thing you look through and you find it. Mr. Alker had two files. He had a personal file and a business file. His business file was 788. That has

(23)

always been his file. Then he had a personal file. Anything pertaining to him, himself personally, went into his file, Alker file.

Q. You are a great admirer of Mr. Alker's, aren't you?

A. To be truthful with you I respect him as a man, but I don't respect him as a businessman.

Q. You would do anything you could for him, wouldn't you?

A. No, sir, anything within reason. That's about all.

Mr. Bull: May I see the affidavit?

Mr. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Bull: I should like at this time to renew my objection to the taking of the testimony on the ground that the testimony which has just been given is based upon and exactly on the subject matter of the affidavit already in the record, and is also on the same general subject matter which was covered in the previous depositions. That is to say the transactions relating to the notes and his knowledge of the notes.

Mr. Taylor: All right.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. Now, how many rooms are there in Mr. Alker's house, if you know?

A. About 12.

(24)

Q. And how many rooms, how many of those rooms contain files?

A. I would say about four, and he used to have some down the basement which I raised hell about because they were getting moldy down there and I had to bring them up.

Q. Did the house have a garage?

A. Yes.

Q. Were there any files in the garage?

A. Yes. There were files out there one time also.

Mr. Taylor: I would like to offer these photostatic notes for the deposition.

Mr. Bull: They are already in the record, Mr. Taylor, are they not?

Mr. Taylor: Yes, they are. I will withdraw them. You recognize them as being in the record?

Mr. Bull: It is my understanding they are in the record.

Mr. White: I suppose since the witness, although over objection, has referred to them they better go in.

Mr. Bull: Yes.

Mr. Taylor: All right.

Mr. Bull: For the purposes of convenience let's put the affidavit in.

Mr. Taylor: Also put in the affidavit of John Pellini dated August 9, 1949.

(25)

Mr. White: Can we identify that as the paper from which the witness refreshed his recollection according to his testimony?

Mr. Bull: That's right.

Mr. Taylor: We agree it is the same affidavit.

Mr. Bull: This is the paper from which you have refreshed your recollection, is that right?

A. Yes.

Mr. Taylor: Is that the only matter from which you have refreshed your recollection?

A. Yes. That is about it.

Mr. Taylor: That's all.

Mr. Bull: That's all.

(Examination concluded at 10:40 A. M.)

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT.

(Filed March 27, 1963)

Per Curiam:

On review of the record we find no error. The District Court's denial of appellants' motion for new trial will be affirmed for the reasons so well stated by Judge Layton in his opinion filed June 20, 1962 and his Memorandum Opinion filed July 12, 1962.

JUDGMENT.

This cause came on to be heard on the record from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the order of July 12, 1962 of the said District Court in this case be, and the same is hereby affirmed, with costs.

Attest:

IDA O. CRESKOFF,
Clerk.

March 27, 1963.

RECEIVED AND FILED
Mar 27 1963
IDA O. CRESKOFF
CLERK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Civil Action No. 3047.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION TO THE USE OF SECRETARY OF BANKING, RECEIVER OF INTEGRITY TRUST COMPANY, TO THE USE OF BUTCHER & SHERRERD AND FIDELITY-PHILADELPHIA TRUST COMPANY, TRUSTEE,

v.

HARRY J. ALKER, JR., AND MAMIE DU BAN, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS EXECUTRIX OF THE ESTATE OF ALFRED A. DUBAN, DECD.

ORDER:

AND NOW, to wit, this 22nd day of November, 1961, upon consideration of the motion of Harry J. Alker, Jr., dated November 15, 1961 (Docket Paper No. 181), appearing pro se, to reopen the case and place his motion for a new trial in the above entitled action (referred to in Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v. Alker, 234 F. 2d 113, at page 117) on the Argument List; together with a petition to take depositions of witnesses in support thereof whose testimony is not already in the record, it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said motion to reopen the case and place upon the Argument List his motion for a new trial be and it is hereby GRANTED; depositions of any witnesses whose testimony is not already in the record to be taken and completed on or before January 15, 1962, and the motion thereafter to be

promptly listed for argument upon special application to the Honorable Caleb R. Layton, III, United States District Judge of Delaware, specially assigned to hear and dispose of said motion.

By THE COURT:

/s/ THOMAS J. CLARY, *Ch. J.*

FEDERAL RULE 60(b).

(b) Mistakes; Inadvertence; Excusable Neglect; Newly Discovered Evidence; Fraud, Etc. On motion and upon such terms as are just, the court may relieve a party or his legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud (whether heretofore denominated intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, release, or discharged, or a prior judgment upon which it is based has been reversed or otherwise vacated, or it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application; or (6) any other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment. The motion shall be made within a reasonable time, and for reasons (1), (2), and (3) not more than one year after the judgment, order or proceeding was entered or taken. A motion under this subdivision (b) does not affect the finality of a judgment or suspend its operation. This rule does not limit the power of a court to entertain an independent action to relieve a party from a judgment, order, or proceeding, or to grant relief to a defendant not actually personally notified as provided in Title 28, U. S. C., § 1655, or to set aside a judgment for fraud upon the court. Writs of coram nobis, coram vobis, audita querela, and bills of review and bills in the nature of a bill of review, are abolished, and the procedure for obtaining any relief from a judgment shall be by motion as prescribed in these rules or by an independent action. As amended Dec. 27, 1946, eff. March 19, 1948; Dec. 29, 1948, eff. Oct. 20, 1949.

12 U. S. C. A. § 1821(g).

(g) In the case of a closed national bank or District bank, the Corporation, upon the payment to any depositor as provided in subsection (f) of this section, shall be subrogated to all rights of the depositor against the closed bank to the extent of such payment. In the case of any other closed insured bank, the Corporation shall not make any payment to any depositor until the right of the Corporation to be subrogated to the rights of such depositor on the same basis as provided in the case of a closed national bank under this chapter shall have been recognized either by express provision of State law, by allowance of claims by the authority having supervision of such bank, by assignment of claims by depositors, or by any other effective method. In the case of any closed insured bank, such subrogation shall include the right on the part of the Corporation to receive the same dividends from the proceeds of the assets of such closed bank and recoveries on account of stockholders' liability as would have been payable to the depositor on a claim for the insured deposit, but such depositor shall retain his claim for any uninsured portion of his deposit: Provided, That, with respect to any bank which closes after May 25, 1938, the Corporation shall waive, in favor only of any person against whom stockholders' individual liability may be asserted, any claim on account of such liability in excess of the liability, if any, to the bank or its creditors, for the amount unpaid upon his stock in such bank; but any such waiver shall be effected in such manner and on such terms and conditions as will not increase recoveries or dividends on account of claims to which the Corporation is not subrogated: Provided further, That the rights of depositors and other creditors of any State bank shall be determined in accordance with the applicable provisions of State law.